

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Lou E. Holder, Calhoun.
Nathaniel M. Elliott, Corbin.

MONTANA

Delta J. O'Neill, Glendive.

NEW YORK

Willis R. Holt, Black River.
Louis R. Mann, Cobleskill.
Hans C. Hansen, Fishers Island.
Albert J. Griffiths, Keuka Park.
Clyde S. Edmister, Lisle.
Rosabelle Harris, Lyons Falls.
Ruth E. Perrin, Potsdam.
Lawrence Mahoney, Winthrop.

WISCONSIN

George S. Allen, Lyndon Station.
Viola Klassy, New Glarus.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1943

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK) laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

I hereby designate Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN, Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our most gracious Father, again we rejoice at Thy mercy; in humble gratitude toward Thee our hearts burn bright and clear. When the days become hard and difficult, we would learn something of the Master's quiet, of his valorous spirit and the hardihood of His faith. When hearts are wounded and sore, let Thy gentle presence come as a healing balm, when there is feverish indecision and unrest, teach us that wise labor can be achieved only when we accept with sincere speech and actions our trusteeship.

Blessed Lord, as we look upon this world, weaponed with hate and death, with our youth on the crimson altar of war, the conflict seems too much for our feeble faith. Forgive and forbid that we should crowd Thee out of our lives, lest our dreams and hopes become dull and faithless. May we never lessen our enthusiasm and ardor to work, as outraged guardians of virtue, against the hordes who make war. We pray that we may undauntedly believe in Him, the Saviour of the world, who taught man to think nobly of himself and ever inspired him toward the highest ideals of saint and philosopher. We bear to the altar of prayer our envoys of good will and especially our renowned Secretary of State; bless him with good health and strength and give him peace. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO ATTEND MEETING OF UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts,

I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 349), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund a sum not to exceed \$500 to defray the actual expenses of such members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as may be designated by the chairman thereof, to attend the meeting of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration at Atlantic City, N. J., beginning Wednesday, November 10, 1943, on vouchers signed by the chairman and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman explain what this resolution is and the necessity for it? Of course, I realize it is privileged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, at the White House at this moment the representatives of 44 nations are signing an agreement setting up what is to be known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Tomorrow those representatives will meet at Atlantic City. The ranking members of the Foreign Affairs Committee requested this small appropriation of \$500 to defray the expenses of any members of that committee selected by the chairman to attend the session at Atlantic City.

There is an agreement here that nothing is to be brought up without the approval of the majority and minority leaders. I may say to the House that the majority and minority leaders, as well as the Speaker, have approved the resolution and I was requested to have the Committee on Accounts meet this morning. The committee met and approved it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is considered important that Members of the House be present to listen in at the rehabilitation meetings to see what is going on?

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman's view. If the newspaper article this morning is correct that our contribution will be a billion and a half dollars a year I will say it is very important that members of the committee that will be forced to bring in the resolution authorizing the expenditure of this amount of money should be at that meeting so that they can fully inform their own committee and the House when they bring in the bill just exactly what it proposes to do. This of course will be important legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So we will know what we are voting on? I made the point in a meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee that our responsibility is very great and that we should be kept fully informed on all that transpires and that we should be allowed to attend the sessions whenever possible.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes. This subject will be thoroughly debated and many questions will be asked.

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, also a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I draw the attention of the House at this moment to a resolution which I presented last week, now before the Rules Committee, requesting the House to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to "investigate," that being the word used, and study all matters pertaining to the relief and rehabilitation agreement, with the idea that the House will hold the Foreign Affairs Committee responsible for the information given it before the House agrees to any such vast sums being expended for such purposes?

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman, but if I understand the rules of the House correctly and the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, it has that power right now without any authority from the Rules Committee or the House.

Mrs. BOLTON. Not in quite the same fashion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman two questions. In the first place, is this resolution privileged so that an objection would be of no avail anyway?

Mr. COCHRAN. It is a privileged resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I recall that when there was this food conference held somewhere in Virginia there was a great deal of criticism in the papers over the purchase of liquor. Is any of this money to be used for the purchase of liquor to entertain any of these foreign guests or any members of the committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. I hope not, but it would not buy much at prevailing prices. I would like to know from the gentleman where they could get it. Where are they going to buy it if it is as scarce around Atlantic City as it is around Washington?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are you interested in that as an individual or as a Congressman?

Mr. COCHRAN. In both, but the gentleman asked me a question and I answered it. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAILROAD LABOR CRISIS

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few moments on the matter to which I think the attention of the House should be drawn, a matter on which the House may have to take some action in the not too distant future.

Perhaps some of you have seen in the press reports of the present transportation situation and the question that has been raised regarding some railway employees. For 20 years our railway unions have been the good boys of the labor movement. They have done many, in fact, most of the things most of us think the labor unions should do, such as keeping racketeers out of their leadership, publishing reports of their funds and expenses, and so forth.

Today—and this is somewhat typical of certain sections of our own administration here in Washington—they are caught between the upper and the nether millstones of two warring executive departments. The Emergency Board allowed an 8-cent-an-hour increase in wages to one section of these employees, not to bring them up to the standard obtained by most labor, particularly in the war plants, but at least to give them some chance to meet the increased cost of living. The Director of Stabilization has refused to let them have this increase. It is to that point that I address myself, because in due time I think we may have to take issue with the Director of Stabilization.

The labor crisis now confronting the railroad industry results primarily from the fact that the wage rates in this big Nation-wide industry are substantially lower than those prevailing in industry generally.

It is well known that there are more jobs today than there are workers to fill them, and it is only natural that wage earners will prefer employment in industries that pay higher wages and grant more favorable working conditions, such as overtime payments.

Under the Wage and Hours Act as enacted several years ago by Congress, the overwhelming majority of wage earners throughout the United States are paid time and one-half for work in excess of 40 hours per week. Congress included the railroad industry in the minimum-wage provisions of that act but excluded the railroad industry from the hours provisions, with the result that railroad workers do not receive the time and one-half required by law after 40 hours.

Many industries pay their employees time and one-half after 40 hours as a result of agreements negotiated with their employees. The President has also issued an Executive order which confirms the general policy of time and one-half for the sixth and double time for the seventh day of any workweek.

The most favorable overtime arrangement now existing for railroad workers is time and one half after 48 hours, but some railways require a certain number of their employees to work 60 hours a week, that is to say, six 10-hour days a week, before time and one-half payments are allowed. As a result of this, the weekly earnings of railway workers

on the overtime basis alone fall short of those in other industries.

As an illustration, let us take a worker engaged at a rate of 50 cents an hour. If he works 60 hours, as is the case on some of the railroads in this country, he is paid for the entire time at straight-time rates and will earn \$30 per week. If he works in other industries where time and one-half is paid after 40 hours, he will earn \$35 per week, or \$5 more than the railroad worker, notwithstanding the fact that the straight-time rate in both instances is 50 cents an hour.

In the railroad wage dispute affecting the nonoperating employees which is rapidly producing a chaotic condition in the Nation's transportation system there are 73 different classes of workers involved and they comprise a total of more than a million workers at this time. These groups embrace many highly skilled craftsmen, such as boilermakers, machinists, blacksmiths, electricians, sheet-metal workers, signalmen, and others. The group embraces highly skilled clerical and telegraph forces, as well as bridge carpenters, railroad bridge and building foremen, track foremen, and others who assume important supervisory responsibilities incident to their employment. The group likewise embraces semiskilled and unskilled workers.

At the time of the hearing held by the Emergency Board that recommended an 8 cents wage increase, the average hourly earnings for these classes of railway employees were 73.8 cents per hour.

According to the National Industrial Conference Board, the average hourly earnings of employees in the 25 major manufacturing industries was 95.8 cents per hour. This is 22 cents per hour more than these 1,000,000 nonoperating railway employees receive and, therefore, if they were granted the 8-cent hourly increase recommended last May by the President's Emergency Board they would still be approximately 15 cents an hour under the average rate for the manufacturing industries.

It is an amazing fact to observe that the average hourly earnings of unskilled, newly hired, common labor in the Nation's manufacturing industries are higher than the average for the railroad industry's nonoperating employees as a whole, notwithstanding the fact that the majority of these nonoperating workers are highly skilled mechanics and craftsmen. At the time of the hearing, when 1,000,000 nonoperating workers received an average of 73.8 cents per hour, the National Industrial Conference Board reported that totally unskilled common labor in 25 manufacturing industries received an average of 81 cents an hour, or 7 cents more than the average for all nonoperating workers in the railroad industry as a whole. If the 8 cents as recommended by the President's Emergency Board was granted to all these nonoperating workers, they would still receive an average wage that would be roughly equal to the average paid common unskilled labor in manufacturing.

These higher wage rates in other industries have not developed suddenly as a result of our more recent war activity.

Railroad wages have lagged behind from year to year and the discrepancy is one that has been developing and growing greater for the past 20 years. As a matter of fact, in 1921, these 73 classes of nonoperating railroad workers received an average of 59 cents an hour when the workers in manufacturing industries received 52.4 cents. It is seen that in 1921 these railway employees earned approximately 7 cents an hour in excess of the average for manufacturing.

However, by 1930, the average railroad wage was 57 cents, but the manufacturing average had climbed to 58.9 or approximately 2 cents above the railroad wage.

In 1939, the railroad average was 63.4 cents, but the average wage in manufacturing had climbed to 72 cents, or approximately 9 cents higher than the railroad wage.

For the year 1941, railroad workers received an average of 67.1 cents when the average wage in the manufacturing industries had climbed to 84.1, which was 17 cents an hour greater than the railroad industry.

As I have already pointed out, the average railroad wage in June of this year was 73.8 cents, while the average in the manufacturing industries was 95.8 or 22 cents more than the railroad wage. Since the hearing, railroad wages have advanced about 1½ cents per hour—due to additional hours of work—while factory wages have advanced 6 cents, increasing the spread to more than 26 cents.

Wage earners in the manufacturing industries are being permitted and in fact urged to work overtime with time and one-half payments for work in excess of 40 hours. This increases their earnings over and above those for railroad men in a greater measure than would be reflected in the comparison of average hourly earnings, since the manufacturing workers get time and one-half time for their work in excess of 40 hours per week, whereas the railroad men work 48 hours and, in some instances, 60 hours per week at straight time rates.

Wages in the building trades, in the printing industry, in shipbuilding, in the aviation industry, and in other major industries are also substantially greater than those prevailing on the railroads.

Every skilled shop mechanic in the railroad industry today with basic wages of 95 and 96 cents per hour could obtain employment in other war industries tomorrow morning at wages ranging from \$1.25 per hour upward. He could also add further to his weekly earnings because of the more favorable overtime provisions to which I have referred.

Every sectionman in the railroad industry today with an average wage of 53 cents an hour could obtain employment in other war industries at wage rates ranging from 75 cents an hour upward and with time and one-half time after 40 hours.

In the final analysis, however, the annual earnings of a wage earner are far more important than his average hourly wage. In this connection, the railroad industry produces an amazing picture of

miserably substandard employee earnings.

According to compilations derived from official Interstate Commerce Commission figures and covering the year 1942 when considerable overtime was worked, there were more than 250,000 of the employees involved in this railway wage dispute whose average annual earnings were less than \$1,500 a year. Approximately 175,000 railway trackmen had average annual earnings of about \$1,350 per year.

In this connection, it is interesting to recall that the United States Department of Labor publishes from time to time a statement showing the intercity differences in cost of living for 33 cities scattered throughout the United States and covering a so-called maintenance level of living standards. These are not healthful or desirable standards of living, but are referred to as maintenance standards below which, if continued for too long a period there may result physical deterioration.

The latest report of this kind as published by the United States Department of Labor was for the period of March 15, 1943, and of the entire 33 cities covered only one, namely Mobile, Ala., called for less than \$1,500 per year. The majority called for annual earnings ranging from \$1,600 to \$1,800. I repeat that these annual earnings figures are not intended to be adequate for a proper or healthful standard of living, but are intended to show the lowest annual income for a four-person manual worker's family that will not produce immediate danger of physical deterioration.

Incidentally, contrary to the opinions of some, the lower living costs are not always to be found in the southern cities where railroad wages in many instances are at the low levels of 40 and 46 cents per hour. For example, the maintenance level for a four-person manual worker's family in Atlanta called for \$1,628 in March of this year. The figure was \$1,600 for New Orleans, \$1,563 for Birmingham and \$1,620 for Jacksonville.

In this connection, it might be pointed out that one of the railway management's exhibits introduced in the wage hearings conducted by the Emergency Board last spring showed that there were 121,140 railway employees whose basic wages were 47 cents per hour or less. There are 306 regular work days in the year under the railroad industry's agreements with their employees, and on the basis of 8 hours per day, an employee who works a full year of 306 days without losing a single hour in a single one of the regular work days, will be employed for 2,448 hours during the year. On that basis, these 121,000 employees at 47 cents per hour or less would earn \$1,150 per year or less. These full-time annual earnings of the railroad workers in the lower wage brackets are \$300 less than the lowest maintenance level requirements reported by the Department of Labor.

From these annual earnings figures, it is also very evident that railroad wage earnings are clearly substandard on an annual basis to the same full extent that

they are substandard on the basis of average hourly earnings.

Under these circumstances, there is nothing surprising about the fact that the trained and experienced forces of the railroad industry have and are leaving it at an alarming pace for higher paying jobs in other industries. The surprising fact is that these railroad workers have remained loyal to their industry and stayed on their job as long as they have while this present wage dispute was being debated and delayed and obstructed for more than a year.

Railroad labor has always been recognized as a high type of labor and the veteran Members of this Congress are well aware of the fact that the railway labor unions involved in this dispute have commanded the respect and admiration of Congress for many years. Even those who raise their voices in the Halls of Congress against certain groups of workers have refrained from any criticism of that portion of organized labor represented by the railway employees. They are a high type of wage earner because the industry in which they are employed is of such a character as to necessitate the highest possible qualification. Unfortunately, however, the low wage rates now prevailing on the railroads have greatly impaired the standard of labor recently recruited to fill job vacancies.

This vitally important industry cannot and will not maintain a satisfactory level of safety or efficiency if it is required to recruit its workers from the lowest brackets of the labor market, and that appears to be precisely the situation that the railroad industry is confronted with at this time. The skilled and experienced men are leaving the industry in large numbers. They are hiring women to do men's work. They are employing 16-year-old children to work on trains and to perform other types of services for which they are unfitted. They are recruiting Mexicans, recalling their pensioners, and seeking the privilege to work war prisoners in this vitally important industry where sabotage on the part of 1 out of 100 could result in great loss of life and property and seriously impair the war effort.

It seems to me that the organized groups of railroad workers are now being unjustly penalized for their good behavior. For 20 years the railroad industry has not seen a major strike. Notwithstanding the lag in the railroad wage structure, these workers have continued on the job and have adjusted their differences with management across the conference table. For years they have paid for this good behavior through low wages and now they are being penalized by being denied an 8-cent hourly increase recommended by a President's Emergency Board after exhaustive hearings that extended over a period of more than 2 months.

If all this is representative of the results that we are to expect from the Office of the Economic Director of Stabilization, then as one Member of Congress, it seems to me that Congress could make a tremendous contribution toward the

successful prosecution of the war by immediately abolishing that office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter written by Mr. G. C. McCall of Norton, Va., to Colonel Neal, chairman of the Selective Service Board in Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in two instances, and to include in one a newspaper article and in the other a brief address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in two instances, and to include in one a news item and in the other an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely unfortunate and greatly to be regretted that two great soldiers and generals are currently being placed in an embarrassing position by politically thinking individuals and groups who link their names with coming political campaigns.

With mighty military operations designed to crush Hitlerism and Tojoism impending, it is most unfair to General Marshall and General MacArthur, and to the millions of fighting Americans under their command, to suggest, even, that either of these great soldiers of the Republic, in an hour like this, would for one second give any consideration to relinquishing his post to engage in a political campaign.

I hope Democrats and Republicans, and everybody else, will refrain from mixing politics with war, and let our

generals lead us on to victory, unhindered by partisan squabbles that tend to divide our people.

POST-WAR PLANNING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that beginning on the 23d of this month the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will start hearings with reference to certain features of post-war planning. I think a great deal of economy can be effected in taking care of unemployment after the war if we have information, discussion, and deliberation with reference to various plans that may be suggested. The municipalities in many instances are quite willing to bear their own expense with reference to the necessary reconstruction and rehabilitation. We do not want to have a long period of idleness as we did after the last war, when we were paying out money for projects which were of no permanent value.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], I ask unanimous consent that that committee may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein comments by Mr. Eric Underwood.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I received from the Director of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein three short editorials in regard to the Secretary of State's magnificent work at the Moscow Conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the program and addresses delivered at the Symbolic Adoption by Fordham University of the Catholic University of Lublin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Fordham University, in New York City, a university under the direction of the Society of Jesus, has set another fine example for our American universities, by her adoption of the Catholic University of Lublin. The formal ceremonies were held at Fordham on Sunday, October 31, 1943.

The appropriate furnishings for the Lublin room were provided by the General Pulaski Memorial Committee.

Every thinking person, interested as he must be, in the cause of learning and the preservation of culture, applauds the generous action of Fordham on behalf of Lublin University. At Fordham, we are sure that the sons of Lublin will find peace, encouragement and the complete opportunity to work and plan for her future in the post-war era in the homeland.

I am grateful to the membership for their unanimous permission to include the following program and addresses delivered at Keating Hall on adoption day.

The program and addresses follow:

INVOCATION DELIVERED IN POLISH BY THE RIGHT REVEREND MONSIGNOR JOSEPH C. DWORZAK

To all who view these presents the trustees of Fordham University and Fordham College give greeting in the Lord.

In the moment of crisis a mother seeks her child's safety before her own. So Poland today, pillaged and oppressed, with outstretched arms implores the world for a shelter and a home for her young University of Lublin.

Hearkening to the mother's cry of misery, Fordham clasps to her breast the destitute university and lovingly opens to her within these halls a refuge from the ruin of war.

Yes; and also a haven of hope, of sure hope, whose fountainhead is the noble patriot, His Excellency, Vladislaus Raczkiewicz. In youth and age, in war and peace, at home and an exile for her cause, he has never failed Poland in her need; and in her latest and her greatest agony it was to him and to him alone that she turned to be her leader and her President. Under his guidance, please God, the glad day will soon dawn when Lublin University according to her sure hope will resume her life and home in a peaceful and prosperous Poland.

Accordingly by these presents we, the trustees of Fordham University and of Fordham College, authorized to that purpose by the supreme power of the State, bear witness that His highly esteemed Excellency, Vladislaus Raczkiewicz, has been advanced by us to the honorary degree of doctor of laws, and endowed with all the rights and privileges pertaining thereunto.

And in proof thereof we have issued these presents under the seal of our corporation and the signature of the president of this college.

Fordham University, New York, the 31st day of October, in the year of Our Lord 1943.

EXCERPTS FROM THE REMARKS OF THE REVEREND ROBERT I. GANNON, S. J., PRESIDENT OF FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

Why select a Polish university rather than Danish or Dutch or Norwegian? Because in

spite of our difficulties with the miserable business of phonetics which seems to separate us from eastern Europe more than from the west, Poland is closer to our own United States than almost any other occupied country. Its art and literature and music seem like our own. Americans enjoy their Chekhov and Dostoevski—but they have the feeling of being far from home when they read them—Lord Jim, on the contrary, and The Nigger of the Narcissus, With Fire and Sword, and Quo Vadis are practically American books. The same with music. Mussorgsky is a treat and we find even the Soviet symphonies interesting. But Chopin is a part of every cultured American's emotional life. Even our political ideals are very nearly identical.

Old slanders are always being revived to the effect that Poland is a nation of serfs ground down by aristocrats who can do nothing but fight among themselves. That is what Russia and Prussia and Austria always wanted the world to believe. It was true once of Poland as it was of almost every other nation in Europe. But if one is going back to semibarbarous times, why pick on Poland?

She was one of the first to liberate the serfs, the first to elect her kings, the first in Europe to organize education for the masses on a uniform basis, the first in Europe to achieve constitutional government founded on the right of the people to rule. This was in 1791 in the midst of the French Revolution. Kosciuszko had just returned from America where he had done so much to liberate the Thirteen Colonies and because he wanted another United States in eastern Europe, the three great powers that surrounded him did the Adolf Hitler, and Poland vanished for 125 years.

Even today, however, people keep saying as though it were a reproach, "Poland is just as full of peasants as ever." What they mean is that farmers there wear picturesque clothes instead of overalls. They are peasants, yes, but the kind that any country would be proud to have. Spiritual, shrewd, and brave. When the Bolsheviks under Trotsky thought they could make Poland a Red bridge into Europe (Trotsky had boasted that he would water his horses in the Rhine) all their blandishments failed to move the self-respecting Polish peasant. He chose order rather than revolution and elected one of his own, the great Witos, as prime minister of his country. It took more than intelligence. It took courage and courage he still possesses in abundance.

The frightful blitzkrieg which swept the land in a few short weeks while England and France were wringing their hands in helpless anguish did not prove that 10 Germans are better than 1 Pole, but merely that 1 armored tank is worth a hundred brave men on horseback.

All this has made it natural that Fordham should want a Polish university on its campus. But why Lublin? Why not glorious Cracow, or beautiful Lwow down on the borderland—or Wilno, or Warsaw? Because Lublin, founded in 1918, was the symbol of the new Poland, the achievement of the incredible group of men who took over a devastated country which had not ruled itself for 125 years, organized its armies, its finances, its judiciary, its education, its foreign service, and solved its land problem to the satisfaction of the agricultural classes.

Now that Paderewski and so many others of these great men are dead who wrought this national miracle, President Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz is the embodiment of his country. In paying homage then to Lublin University and to the head of the Polish Government, Fordham reverently and solemnly salutes the spirit of modern Poland.

This very week momentous decisions are being made by our allied representatives in Moscow. We feel sure that much definite

good will be accomplished, but in some respects we can only hope for the best.

Doubtless, however, our representatives are mindful of Napoleon's words on St. Helena, "My failure to establish a strong Poland, the cornerstone of European stability, my failure to destroy Prussia, and my blunder with regard to Russia were the three great errors of my life."

Hitler has established the present-day peril of the third great error. May the United States and her dearest ally not overlook the other two.

ADDRESS OF DR. OSCAR HALECKI, PROFESSOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW AND DIRECTOR OF THE POLISH INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES IN AMERICA

Prof. Oscar Halecki, of the University of Warsaw, director of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, president of the Polish University in Exile which was created in Paris, in the fall of 1939, with the participation of representatives of the University of Lublin, expressed to the president and trustees of Fordham University the deep gratitude of the Polish University professors for their generous decision to adopt the University of Lublin.

"In times of peace," said Professor Halecki, "the University of Lublin would celebrate on these very days the twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation, simultaneously with the same anniversary of Poland's restored independence. Being one of our youngest universities, it has, however, a tradition going back as far as 1594, when a university was created at Zamosc, a few miles only from Lublin by the great statesman and educator, Jan Zamoyski. Reviving that tradition, the founders of the University of Lublin placed it in a city famous in Polish history. It was here that the Polish-Lithuanian Federation originated in 1386 and was definitely established in 1569.

"Like that of Zamosc, the new university was founded with a view to spreading western culture in the east of Europe, and it is worth recalling that Lublin is the only Catholic university east of a line going from Nimwegen in Holland and Louvain in Belgium through Fribourg, Switzerland, to Milan and to Rome. The Polish center of Christian culture, suffering cruel persecution with all the other Polish universities, is now connected with one of the most important Catholic centers of learning in the United States of America, a large university directed by the same Jesuit order which started the Polish universities of Wilno in 1579 and of Lwow in 1661.

"Smaller than these and other State universities of our country and remaining a private foundation, supported by the Polish hierarchy Lublin closely cooperated with all our institutions of higher education and the high standard of its instruction was officially recognized. The distinguished scholars who during more than 20 years were members of the Lublin faculty, created in connection with the university and the well-known library of Lublin a learned society which issued many valuable publications. The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America is happy to be able to offer a few of these publications to the new Lublin Hall on the Fordham campus in honor of our colleagues in Lublin, Poland, to whom the symbolic ceremony of tonight will be a unique comfort and a ray of light amidst the darkness of their present existence.

"May I express the hope that Fordham's inspiring example will be followed and that other Polish universities will be as fortunate as Lublin in finding American institutions interested in their survival."

DEDICATION OF THE LUBLIN ROOM

By this unique ceremony, Fordham University, desirous of keeping alive that great and ancient tradition of Polish culture which the invader has sought systematically to an-

nihilate, will provide on its own campus a hallowed spot where Lublin can find an honorable refuge until the day of victory and peace when all the universities of Poland will light their lamps again.

CONFERRING OF HONORARY DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF LAWS

The conferring of the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws on His Excellency Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, president of the Republic of Poland.

ADDRESS OF JAN CIECHANOWSKI, POLISH AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, Your Excellency Most Reverend Bishop, Mr. Vice President, members of the faculty, ladies, and gentlemen, I have the signal honor gratefully to receive on behalf of Mr. Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, president of the Republic of Poland, the degree of doctor of laws honoris causi, which the rector and faculty of Fordham University have bestowed upon him.

On behalf of President Raczkiewicz I have the honor to express his profound gratitude for this high distinction and to assure the Reverend Rector, the members of the faculty, and alumnae of Fordham University, that he will always greatly value and cherish this distinction which he accepts as a high tribute paid to Poland and to the Polish Nation, for centuries the vanguard of Christian ideals, ever ready to fight and to suffer in their defense.

Hitler has been endeavoring to destroy all Poland's intellectual life, to exterminate our spiritual leaders, our scientists, professors, teachers, writers, musicians, and poets. The Germans in Poland are torturing and murdering them in the hope of turning Poland into a spiritual desert, and of reducing our population to slavery.

In adopting the Catholic University of Lublin, and thus symbolically taking the first step toward the rebuilding of ruined European culture, Fordham University is paying a tribute to the faith and culture of Poland, so valiantly fighting for our common ideals and civilization.

This university is paying a tribute to the sufferings of those innumerable martyrs, tortured to death and trampled down by the blind robots of German "Machtkultur."

I can assure you that when the news of the noble gesture of Fordham University reaches Poland, it will strengthen the spirit of those who are fighting and perishing there. It will prove to them that there are spiritual forces in America which are watching to insure that out of this brutal war there will emerge a better world, in which their wrongs will be righted.

In our modern world of mechanical and technical progress, the sky appears to be the only limit of human enterprise. The speed of scientific achievement precedes the actual requirements of our life. We follow breathless in the wake of discovery and invention and endeavor hastily to adapt our lives to the profound changes caused by scientific progress, rather than to control and to direct its course.

Life consists of hasty mental and physical adjustments at a pace which drives us on, ever expectant and eager to fit our lives to the miraculous innovations of our hectic century. In this atmosphere of speed, thinking appears to have become the greatest of all adventures. And yet, never before has calm, concentrated, and constructive thought been so urgently indispensable.

Two world wars of unprecedented magnitude and consequences have been allowed to succeed one another in the course of one quarter of a century. They were separated by the short breathing space of an unstable peace.

In both cases, after brief hesitations, civilized mankind rallied successfully to the defense of the principles of Christianity, justice, and human decency, mortally threatened

by the revival of a mechanized expression of prehistoric barbarism.

But the tragic truth remains that, had we been as bold and as united in time of peace, as we finally became in time of war—both world conflicts would have been prevented.

The now certain victory of the United Nations will bring the end of actual fighting. Upon the smothering embers of a total war, in the midst of unprecedented chaos, of suffering, famine, destitution, and despair hitherto unrecorded in history—human statesmanship will be called upon to establish a just and durable peace, to restore new and permanent bases of security, to build, this time, upon solid moral, political, social, and economic foundations a new world order of peace for all nations in which international confidence will replace distrust, and the consciousness of real security will abolish fear—that most dangerous element of insecurity, which for some 30 years has dominated international relations.

Never before has human statesmanship been faced by so stupendous a task. Providence has never given so great a responsibility to mankind, or so great and so creative a chance of reasserting and reinstalling the great moral values and principles of our faith, of justice and freedom for all people.

To face these realities we will have to launch wholeheartedly into the great adventure of constructive thinking.

We will have to reject the temptations of cowardly appeasement and wishful thinking, patchwork statesmanship, superannuated concepts of power politics, of division of the world into spheres of interest, of precarious theories of balance of power.

At the price of countless millions of human lives and material wealth sacrificed in these two world wars, we have learned that world war and world peace alike are indivisible, that in our times of abolished distance isolation has become but a futile slogan, and collaboration in peacetime is not a matter of choice, but a matter of even more urgent necessity than in wartime.

We must realize that not only both war and peace have respectively become indivisible—but that also justice and freedom are indivisible, and that real security and social peace require that prosperity should likewise be regarded as indivisible the world over.

While these important considerations will have to guide the thoughts of the statesmen entrusted with the task of planning the future peace, they will have to reach even deeper to the basic human fundamentals for their guidance.

Paradoxical as it may sound, experience teaches us that the purest idealism and the highest principles have to be invoked to stir up nations to fight a war, that most inhuman thing in the world, whereas cynicism, compromising with ideals and principles, and crude materialism appear to govern our minds when establishing the conditions of peace, that most natural and noble state of human and international relations.

If mankind is to be saved from the recurrence of the scourge of aggressive wars, we cannot compromise with the ideals and principles for which we are fighting. We must be determined to apply them in practice in building the future peace.

The noble principles of President Woodrow Wilson and his League of Nations concept did not fail because they were too idealistic. They failed because the United States refused to collaborate in their application and because the statesmen responsible for their maintenance were too timid to support them by the realism indispensable to enforce them in our world of imperfect human beings.

History proves that all past methods of establishing and maintaining peace have been unstable, precarious, and relatively short-lived.

Living for over 30 years in an atmosphere of insecurity has profoundly affected our

very mentality. Events threatening peace have outdistanced statesmanship. Statesmen dominated by the fear of conflicts applied palliative measures calculated to prolong an insecure peace, rather than resort to bold measures for the reestablishment of real security.

But the most perilous consequence of insecurity was undoubtedly the tendency on the part of some powers to glorify the state at the cost of the individual freedom of the citizen. Aggressive totalitarian imperialism and enslavement can flourish only in countries where individual freedom does not exist.

To build on a world scale the foundations of security necessary for the establishment of a just and enduring peace, it will be indispensable to give full consideration to this important fact.

Freedom is not a limited birthright of world powers, or even of smaller States. Freedom starts with that of the individual. The greatness of the Catholic doctrine, the whole strength and enduring rightness of democracy depend on the respect and preservation of the freedom of the individual. That is the most fundamental, the most precious achievement of our Christian civilization. It is its very foundation. It is the essence of our faith in the existence of the human soul. It is the mainstay of family life and of that of the human community which is the only sound basis of national existence and independence and of international equality.

This fundamental principle must be reinstated, fully maintained and safeguarded in establishing the new world order of peaceful human collaboration on the basis of equality, which alone can bring to our torn and suffering world lasting peace and real security.

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, THE MOST REVEREND STEPHEN J. DONAHUE, D. D., AUXILIARY BISHOP OF NEW YORK

I am indeed happy and privileged tonight to preside at this very unusual and unique ceremony. His Excellency our beloved archbishop and distinguished alumnus of Fordham requested me to represent him on this occasion and extend his best wishes to the eminent envoy of the Polish Government. He deeply regrets that previous important and pressing duties prevented him from personally being present.

This function is unique in character because it is believed that Fordham is the first American institution of learning to adopt another university for the duration of the war. Tonight Fordham assumes the kindly role of an educational stepmother as she extends the hand of true friendship and maternal protection to Lublin University, known and lauded throughout Poland and Europe since the days of its foundation. The president of Fordham has already stated his reasons for this act of kindness. He wishes it to be recorded as a "slight return for the cultural help and influence which our universities had received from the Old World and as an expression of the principle to keep the lamp of learning burning everywhere throughout the world in spite of the oppression and temporary devastation of totalitarianism."

Catholic education, like the Catholic faith, will never die or be extinguished in the hearts and minds of men. The mission of the Church is to preach the gospel to every creature everywhere. Vandals may tear down and destroy our institutions; tyrants may torture and put to the sword the bodies of Christ's followers, but the living, burning, ardent faith which is implanted in the souls of men can never perish from the earth. "For behold, I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world," is Christ's promise.

Yes, the valiant courageous unbroken spirit of courageous Poland is still uncon-

quered. Tonight we pay our tribute of admiration and respect to the sturdy faith, the dauntless hope, and the intrepid courage of the Polish people. Their persecutors and oppressors have ground them almost into the dust, but the light of their spirit still flickers and will flame again most brilliantly as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow. Poland has heard and is following the council and admonition of Christ Himself when He said to His disciples: "When they shall persecute you in this city, flee into another."

It seems a far cry from Lublin University to Fordham University in New York, but the charity of Christ and our Catholic faith have spanned that distance in the twinkling of an eye of love. Tonight the president and the faculty of Fordham are to be commended and praised for this generous act of sympathy and encouragement manifested towards a sister university, innocently suffering the ravages of a cruel war.

May God bless doubly the loyal sons of Ignatius who, true to the spirit of their saintly founder, did not pass their neighbor by, but have brought Lublin University into their very household to await the day of liberation and peace.

May God give comfort and strength to the Polish people whose intense sufferings and cruel privations have been chronicled again on the pages of history as symbols of courage and fortitude and fidelity. May the day soon dawn when we shall see Poland rise again glorious and triumphant to take her rightful place among the world where she shall bring the inspiration of her Christian culture and Catholic tradition to those who have refused to accept and acknowledge Christ as their King.

May God bless Fordham University. May God bless Poland. May God bless the United States of America.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the death of the New Deal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Hon. W. Arthur Simpson, a farmer and businessman and long-time public official, before the Montpelier Rotary Club, November 8, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech delivered by Mr. Roane Waring.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a let-

ter written by Wayne W. Parish, editor and publisher of Aviation, to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after the regular order of business, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all other legislative matters and special orders are disposed of, I be permitted to address the House for a period of 20 minutes, on November 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES AND THE PRICE OF MEAT

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Price Administrator Chester Bowles in his first press release as the new Administrator, attempts to inform the public that unless Congress grants money for the payment of subsidies that the price of food to the housewife and to the consumer will advance tremendously, and I quote, "A 5-pound rib roast would go up in price by 23 cents while 3 pounds of veal cutlets would cost the housewife 18 cents more than the current price. A 15-pound ham would go up 67 cents, butter would increase by 10 cents a pound."

Mr. Speaker, it must take a great amount of mental gymnastics and the juggling of figures to have the price of meat go up 6 cents a pound if the subsidy now being paid the packer of \$1.10 a hundred on the carcass is removed.

It must be remembered that when the roll-back was established on meat last June that immediately the price of cattle was rolled back on to the farmers and the producers. Just why an increase of 6 cents a pound for veal would occur with the removal of the subsidy of 1.1 cents per pound can only be understood by a professor of economics. It does not make sense to the rest of the country. I looked over their complicated charts, and being only a physician, they confounded and confused me to the nth degree.

It is quite apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the President who is responsible for these bureaus, is intent upon blaming Congress for increased living costs if they do not provide subsidies. It is time, Mr.

Speaker, that this Congress demand action and insist that a food administrator who has the authority will deal with all matters pertaining to food, its production, processing, and its distribution.

The day of reckoning is not far off, and may the angels of Heaven have mercy on these poor deluded economists and new dealers who are making such a mess out of price control and the production of food.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Eldorado.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CORDELL HULL'S WORK AT MOSCOW

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I called attention to the fact that a little group of interventionist propagandists throughout this country were abusing and maligning Cordell Hull and trying to prevent his being sent as a representative of the United States to the Moscow Conference. Secretary Hull is an internationalist and not an interventionist. He has done a great work; no man on earth could have done it better.

Yet, today, we find this same group of interventionists—not satisfied with maintaining peace among the nations of the earth but wanting us to intervene whenever their plans are interfered with—criticizing Secretary Hull for what he did at Moscow and criticizing the United States Senate because it has carried out the provisions of the Moscow Conference agreement and followed the mandate of the Constitution of the United States in providing a legal method for approving any international agreements we may enter into.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, Cordell Hull has done a great work, and if he never did anything else but to turn down this little group of interventionists who are trying to dictate the foreign policies of the United States, he would deserve the undying gratitude of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 20 minutes.

STRIKES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include three newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LXXXIX—599

DISASTER THREATENS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago, the President told us that the war must be viewed as a whole; that the home front could not be separated from the battle front. In a sense, that is true, for the victory cannot be won if the battle of production and transportation be lost here at home.

Just as two armies with a common objective must work together, so must we at home give unqualified support to the men at the front, and just as the objective of a campaign may be lost because one army fails to give proper support, so may the war be lost because of our failure on the home front.

The President also pointed out that, even though the victory be won abroad, inflation and the evils which always follow might bring disaster. Others have time and again called attention to the futility of a military victory if the end of the war finds us without our liberty, our freedom, our constitutional form of government.

Disunity in France, the yielding of the government to the demands of minority labor groups, brought France to her knees and the German divisions to Paris. Here in America, the ruinous results of the President's labor policy are today apparent to even the most unobserving, the most biased and prejudiced so-called friends of labor.

The press, as day follows day, carries notice of new strikes, of the continuation of old ones. In so many localities, in so many industries, has the production of guns, of tanks, of planes, of ships, of ammunition, been slowed down or completely stopped, that even the great daily newspapers, which for months, although fully aware of the situation through their own news items, have lacked the courage to comment editorially and to condemn the evil, have at last begun to speak out.

In editorial after editorial, during the last few weeks, some of the editorial writers of the great dailies have ventured to clearly point out the danger which is so fast overtaking us.

In last night's Washington Star, appeared two editorials. They are marked exhibits A and B and printed herewith.

It is encouraging to at last learn that some of the editorial writers, who, in years gone by, have condemned and branded as antilabor those of us who saw and pointed out the danger long ago, now have the courage to join in the drive to remedy the situation.

In one of these editorials, we find this paragraph:

Mr. Lewis has demonstrated that in time of war he can bend the Government to his will. He can do this because the Government—the administration and Congress—has made him so strong that his strike could not be broken without paying a ruinous price in terms of lowered military efficiency.

It is true, as stated in that paragraph, that Lewis has demonstrated that, in time of war, he can bend the Government to his will. It is equally true that the administration and governmental agencies, whose policy is dictated by the administration, have made him strong.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Concurring entirely in what the gentleman has said so far, did not the gentleman some few months ago tell this House the passage of the Smith-Connally bill would do away with the strikes?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who told the House that?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I understand that you did, amongst many others. You certainly advocated its passage to do away with such strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not tell this House the passage of the Smith-Connally bill would do away with strikes. I thought it was a step in that direction. But I never said at any time, at any place, that any law would be self-enacting; that the passage of any law would by its enactment cure any evil. When you have an administration that will not enforce the law, Congress can enact until it is black in the face and all the paper has been used in printing laws, but you cannot stop wrong conduct merely by passing a law. The gentleman is aware we tried that when we adopted prohibition.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Yes, but the gentleman was well aware of that before he advocated the passage of the Smith-Connally bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly. You would not repeal all the laws against murder and arson and robbery and larceny would you, just because those crimes are still committed? The passage of the Smith-Connally law was a move in the right direction, and if the President of the United States would perform his sworn duty and enforce that law now it would aid in lessening strikes.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. May I ask the gentleman another question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Has not the Smith-Connally bill legalized strikes to the extent that it has told the employers—and I happen to be one, or I happen to be an executive of one—to the extent that if they have a secret ballot then the strike is legal if it is certified by the W. L. B.?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the Supreme Court legalized strikes and picketing long, long ago. You are surely aware of that.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I am surely aware that today if my employees strike the only recourse I have under the Smith-Connally bill is to go to the Government and have them take over. Under the Smith-Connally bill they cannot strike against the Government. Then the Government takes my business and tells me what I have to pay and all the rest of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is correct, but that hardship does not grow out of the Smith-Connally law, it was practiced before that law went into effect. And whose fault is it that that injustice prevails? It is the fault of the administration.

To go back to the charge that Congress is partly to blame for the present deplorable

able situation, it is true that Congress as a whole has permitted Lewis, Murray, Green, and other labor leaders—some of them racketeers, some of them convicts—to defy the law of the land, deprive the citizen of his constitutional rights.

It should be remembered, however, that the House on two occasions, by a two-thirds vote, passed the Smith bill and sent it to the other body, where it never was acted upon. It should not be forgotten that the House, by a substantial majority, passed the Hobbs bill and sent it over to the other end of the Capitol, where it was quietly buried.

Because of the inaction of the other body, racketeering and extortion—what one Supreme Court Justice characterized as plain highway robbery—is still lawful, insofar as Federal law is concerned.

Congress did assist, through the La Follette so-called Civil Liberties Committee, the C. I. O. in its organizing drive. It did aid the C. I. O. and the Communists within its ranks when they unlawfully, in violation of constitutional rights and the law of the land, took possession of the property of individuals; converted it to their own purpose; drove honest workmen and women from the jobs on which they were dependent for a livelihood.

By the enactment of the Wagner law and the subsequent interpretation and administration of it; by a National Labor Relations Board which, by its bias and its prejudice, its utter disregard of the unquestioned rights of employees, finally brought down upon its head not only the condemnation of employers but of William Green and of John L. Lewis, both of whom characterized it as unfair and biased, the foundation was laid for our present strikes.

A little quiet thinking, the use of a little common sense, would have made it apparent to even the most casual observer as early as 1937 that the administration had set its feet on a road which could end only in disaster, even in time of peace, and which, if followed through, in time of war would make it impossible to win the war, would bring defeat.

The determination of certain Communists and of certain labor leaders to subjugate industry and production to their will became apparent in the late days of 1936. There was information during the closing months of that year that the Communists, infiltrating into the labor unions, intended to wreck free enterprise; to, if possible, destroy our constitutional government.

On the last days of December 1936 and during the first days of January 1937, armed goon squads from other States, some traveling hundreds of miles, invaded Michigan; took possession of private property; intimidated and beat peaceful employees and, from January until the 10th day of June 1937, violated the laws of the State, of the Federal Government; defied the courts and, while so doing, received the support of the then Governor of Michigan, Frank Murphy, now on the Supreme Court of the United States, and of the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again? Mr. HOFFMAN. In a minute.

Today, although the Congress, by a more than two-thirds vote, passed the Connally-Smith Act outlawing strikes in war industries except under certain circumstances, and although that law has been repeatedly violated, the President of the United States has failed to perform his sworn duty, institute prosecutions through his Attorney General and end the intolerable situation which today is lessening, as it has for months past lessened, the flow of needed munitions of war, which otherwise would have gone to the men who are doing the fighting and the dying for the preservation of this Government.

For months, we have known that slow-downs, work stoppages, and strikes have lessened the ability of the men on the front to protect themselves, to defeat the enemy; but, during all that time, this administration and the Congress, let it be said, have failed to take aggressive action to eradicate the evil.

Just last week, testifying before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, the head of a union, one Tom DeLorenzo, admitted that the employees of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation in certain of its plants had not worked more than one-third of the time and he also admitted that, during the same period of time, many of the employees had received pay and a half and double pay.

Pay and a half and double pay is one of the special privileges granted by this administration to workers of the Nation, who, through their organizations, are powerful politically.

This same union president, who controls some 18,000 workers, admitted under oath that he "declared war on" the management of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation because it did not give his union credit for certain social activities.

He also admitted under oath that, when it was sought to induct certain employees into the armed service, and Major Brady, of Selective Service, asked the management of Brewster Aeronautical Corporation to determine whether the worker was essential, he, DeLorenzo, as head of the union, told management to notify the Navy that it was "none of its damned business" whether a certain individual should or should not be inducted, and to advise Major Brady of Selective Service that he could "go to hell."

This administration and the country as a whole and the men who are fighting our battles thousands of miles from home are now reaping the fruits of the seeds the administration planted when, in the early days of 1937, in utter disregard of every principle of justice and of law, it supported the violence and the unlawfulness of the sit-down strikers.

Bear in mind that it was in the 1936 campaign that labor unions contributed some \$770,000 to the New Deal campaign fund and that, of that amount, John L. Lewis and his union advanced some \$500,000.

Why did the unions contribute three-quarters of a million dollars toward the election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt? What did the unions expect to get?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I agree with a great deal of what the gentleman says.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All of it so far.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. But he is talking here now about what some of us knew before. It is a question of the Executive and the administration; it is not a question of the necessary laws, the passage of laws, or the repeal of laws. The gentleman pointed that out himself, and yet a few months ago he advocated the passage of a law; and what is he advocating now? A lot of us already know what he is saying.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield for a longer speech; the gentleman must get a little time himself. I will admit I knew all this—the danger that is inherent in lawless labor practices which destroy the liberty of the citizen.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. What good is the war going to do then?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman knows; he is not dumb. The purpose of the war is the defeat of our foreign enemies. We here at home must carry on and win the battle on the home front, that is, production for the armed forces and the preservation of our constitutional liberties.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. What good is the war doing?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman knows I did not advocate war. I know that Members of the House knew of the danger which would come to our Government through unrestrained strikes, violence, and a disregard of law, and, by the introduction of bills, I attempted to remedy the defect in the legislation then existing.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. The gentleman just admitted that laws do not do any good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, that is not accurate. I admit that laws which are not enforced are of no value. But the primary responsibility for enacting laws is upon Congress, then the burden shifts to the Executive. If he fails, it then becomes the duty of Congress to see that the laws are enforced. I must decline to yield further; I have only a few minutes more. The gentleman asks why I do not do something about it.

The reply is obvious. I am only one of 435 Members of the House and neither the Speaker nor the House will let me vote more than once. You give me 400 votes, or 250 and I will show you something along that line.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. But the gentleman just said that a law was no good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is correct if it is not enforced. The House passed the Smith bill twice by a two-thirds majority and sent it down the aisle.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. It did not do any good.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; we did not get anywhere with that bill because it did not become a law. We cannot control the Senate. We passed the act and sent it over there. We passed a bill, the Hobbs bill, and sent it over there, a bill which merely prohibits racketeering by union men, extortion by union men, and over there it is pigeonholed because of the influence of the executive department, of an administration which as the circumstances indicate made this trade with labor politicians. The gentleman says that a law does not do any good? He asks why not do something?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. The gentleman himself said it, Mr. Speaker; he said it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Way back in 1939 I spent some 60 days rewriting the Wagner Act which practically everyone admits is the foundation of much of our present trouble. To that act, and the gentleman ought to agree with that, to that act I offered a substitute which provided that a man should be allowed to join or not to join—oh, yes—or not to join; a union, that employees should be free from coercion from any source—get that—from union bosses, racketeers like De Lorenzo, men like Green and Murray who insist that no man shall work, not even in support of a son or brother who has gone to the front, unless he has paid tribute to the union.

Another change was that the findings of the N. L. R. B.—and that Board was condemned most vigorously by both Murray and Green—should not be final. I put that bill in. What became of it? I have reintroduced it at every session since and it is still before the Congress. Most people will admit that the Wagner law needs revision. It needs amending. Has the gentleman done anything to help me? Oh, no; that would be anti-labor. He did not know it was before us, did he?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. The gentleman has just announced it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have announced it many times before.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I was not in the House when it was first presented.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has been here for several years, and surely he must know that this situation has been called to the attention of the House almost every week.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Every day.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will go further and I will say that I have labored with my colleagues but I did not get anywhere, perhaps because of my method or my personality, or it may possibly be because there was a fear of the labor vote. But since the election earlier this month I notice that there is a drive on, especially on the Republican side, to enact remedial legislation, to cut appropriations, to bring about economy, to insure full, all-out support of the war.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I desire to get back to the main subject of discussion, which, as I understood it, was that away back in 1936, 1937, and 1938, when those sit-down strikes occurred in Michigan, the President and the then Governor of Michigan, Governor Murphy, at that time sowed the wind which we are now reaping in the form of a whirlwind. Is that the thesis of the gentleman's speech?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot be that poetic or oratorical. I am just saying the new dealers are now getting what was coming to them. Unfortunately, as the rain falls on the just and the unjust, so the consequences of the administration's political maneuvers, of its disregard of constitutional processes, fall now upon the innocent as well as upon the guilty new dealers.

Mr. MASON. It is a whirlwind they sowed at that time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Everyone knew it was coming and this House lacked the courage to force through the Senate legislation which would have cured it.

We have had two elections. We had one in 1942, in which this House received a mandate as to what it should do. We had another one earlier this month and it now seems certain that Republicans will force action, and that, with the help of the Democrats—and many of them are not at heart new dealers—we may be able to accomplish something.

All power to those Republicans who, since election, have perfected an organization designed to carry on the work which I have been doing for the last 5 years. Five years is a long, long time to plead for action in behalf of the people, especially when the necessity for it—to me, at least—seemed evident and beyond question.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish the gentleman would not be so hard on the Republicans. There are twice as many Republicans who sit here day after day seeking an opportunity to enact legislation which will rescue the country from the New Deal's fallacies as there are Democrats.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have noticed that. But let me say to the gentleman that there are many Members on the other side who have no use whatever for New Deal policies; and if we on this side will just avoid giving them offense, welcome their aid, and assist them with their problems, we shall find our task much easier.

Let us go back now to this question of the political contributions made by the unions.

Did they contribute it so that they might call strikes without fear of Federal interference? Did they contribute it so that, when controversies arose, the administration would take the part of labor as against management?

Because of that contribution, did the Government afterward, when war came, seize the property of corporations, compel employees, who did not want to join a union, to join a union, pay an initia-

tion fee, monthly dues, and special assessments?

Were the special privileges granted time and again to members of certain unions granted because of the contribution which had been made during the 1936 campaign? Has the granting of these special privileges, the immunity from prosecution which certain labor leaders have enjoyed, been the result of the continued political support given to the President in successive campaigns?

What connection, if any, is there between the political support given this administration by Curran's maritime union and his deferment from active service, "red" as he is?

See Pegler's article of yesterday on Curran, printed herewith as exhibit C.

Why was Walter Reuther, one of the brothers who said, "Work for a Soviet America," deferred when his number came up? Was it because Reuther was expected to swing the votes of the union men, whom he controls, to the support of the President when needed?

Sidney Hillman, born abroad, at one time member of a Federal board which passed upon questions of interest to union men, was, at the same time, paid a salary by his union. Hillman now is one of the fourth-term boosters.

Louis Lepke Buchalter was, in New York, convicted of murder and ordered to be executed. Two of Buchalter's co-defendants are in the death house at Sing Sing, awaiting execution. It is said that one of Buchalter's backers is Sidney Hillman. The Federal authorities are holding Buchalter; will not deliver him to the New York authorities to be executed for the murder of which he was convicted. Is there any connection between the fact that, so far, the President has failed to order the Department of Justice to turn Buchalter over to New York authorities, and the fact that Sidney Hillman is a fourth-term booster?

Is there any connection between the fact that Walter Winchell, week after week, viciously and falsely charges Senators and Congressmen with a lack of patriotism, and the fact that, when his nasty libels could be no longer stomachached by the Navy, he was called, figuratively speaking, to spew forth his filth from his place beneath the White House porch, under which, like a whiffet, the President shelters him?

Yes, the President has slapped in the face his War Labor Board, Administrators Byrnes and Vinson, and, while the miners were still on strike, defying him; while their activities were endangering the operation of our factories, upon which the success, the very lives of our armed forces, depended—the President settled the coal strike. He surrendered. He surrendered to John L. Lewis in time of war.

The Treasury Department may print the President's likeness, in its bond-selling campaign, on billboards throughout the country, and in the papers. He may be hailed as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, but the head of a union can get by with the statement

that a major in the Selective Service can "go to hell."

There was nothing new in the attitude of DeLorenzo, as given to the Naval Affairs Subcommittee last week. Way back in 1939, Local No. 208, C. I. O., told the Navy to do the same thing, and the Navy—the administration—did nothing about it.

Yes; the President, as President and as Commander in Chief, settled the coal strike and, in settling it while the men were still on strike, he acknowledged that John L. Lewis was his master.

Today, as the result of the settlement of the coal strike, the Nation is now confronted with the demand of certain railroad workers, of the steel workers, and of others, that they, too, be given increases in wages.

The clawing, snarling cat of the sit-down-strike days has become the tiger of today, and the President lacks either the courage or the inclination to stand back of Congress in its efforts to bring about an all-out production on the home front.

On the President's doorstep is the overgrown dictator, which was nursed and nurtured by the President when the sit-down strike was characterized as but an expression of social progress, social gain.

That the foregoing remarks may not be branded as carping criticism without the suggestion of a remedy, permit me to again call attention to the fact that, down through the sessions of this House held in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942 attention was repeatedly called by me to the situation and, as long ago as March 13, 1939, the Wagner Act, the unfair provisions of which are now recognized as the vehicle which brings much of our trouble, was completely rewritten and a substitute offered to the Congress.

In parallel columns, on pages 1280 to 1297 of volume 86, part 14 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, will be found the original act and the act as rewritten by me.

Even though the rewritten bill may have been imperfect, even though it did not completely meet the need, a careful reading will show that its adoption would have prevented, had it been enforced, many of the evils which exist today.

If it is not presumptuous, let me once more call the attention of the majority leadership, of the minority leadership, to this bill, which was reintroduced in 1941 and again this year.

Permit me, too, to suggest to those Members of the House, who spurred on by the results of the last elections and now riding the crest of the wave of popular indignation against the New Deal, that they give this proposed revision of the Wagner Act consideration and adopt it as one of the planks of their program.

They have been irked, as I have been irked, by the inaction of the House; by the failure of the House to assert itself, to insist that it was a coordinate branch of the Government; by its failure to fight the administration's attempt to render it innocuous.

Of course, the situation has been a difficult one. First there was a depres-

sion. Then came the war, and every man who ventured to oppose the New Deal was, by its smear artists, its scandal mongers, branded as unpatriotic. But now the tide has turned and those who wanted action have the opportunity to get results.

I will be only too glad to aid in their efforts and I congratulate them upon the stand which they have taken. A united active Republican organization in the House, with the assistance of our friends on the other side, can restore the Government of this country to the people.

Let us be about the business of our constituents.

EXHIBIT A

GOVERNMENT YIELDS

The one valid justification that can be advanced for the "settlement" of the wage dispute with the United Mine Workers is that the Nation's wartime need of coal left the President and his subordinates with no alternative but to come to terms with John L. Lewis. No one can seriously doubt that this was the case. But, when this acknowledgment is made, it follows inevitably that Mr. Lewis and the miners, using their economic power and the other weapons conferred on them by "slanted" laws, have been able to force the Government to yield to their demands.

This is a fact which cannot fail to give rise to grave misgivings. When one man and one union, comprising a negligible minority of all the people can successfully dictate to the country as a whole we cannot hope to escape undesirable consequences. First, there are those of an immediate nature.

In this instance, Secretary Ickes, acting under instructions from the President, negotiated a contract with Mr. Lewis while the miners were on strike in open defiance of a Presidential order that they return to work. That destroys a fundamentally sound policy of the War Labor Board—not to treat with any union while a strike is in progress—and it is an open invitation to other irresponsible labor leaders to enforce their demands by resort to strikes. The rights of the employers—it seems a little ridiculous even to mention employer rights in this setting—have been trampled on in the settlement, which they will have to accept if they are to get their mines back. Finally, the higher earnings that the miners are to receive will necessitate an increase in the price of coal. That strikes at the heart of the stabilization program by nullifying the proposition that increased earnings will not be approved if they result in higher consumer costs. In effect, Mr. Lewis has been pacified at a price which is to be passed on to the consuming public. No amount of equivocation can conceal the truth of this.

These are some, but not all, of the losses which may be expected to flow immediately from this settlement. In the longer view it has even more disturbing implications.

Mr. Lewis has demonstrated that in time of war he can bend the Government to his will. He can do this because the Government—the administration and the Congress—has made him so strong that his strike could not be broken without paying a ruinous price in terms of lowered military efficiency. If Mr. Lewis can do this during the war, what is to be expected when the restraints imposed by military necessity are lifted? Is a government which finds it necessary to yield in wartime going to assert authority in behalf of all the people when hostilities have ended? There is little reason to believe so, and it is certain that this will not be done while we continue to operate on the theory that or-

ganized labor is economically weaker than industry, and that therefore it needs the protection of a legislative system heavily weighted in its favor. When this war is over we are going to face the question whether organized labor, protected by weighted laws, is going to dictate to the Government, and through the Government to the country as a whole. If the pattern of the coal settlement is to be followed this will be the case. But the ultimate answer rests with all of the people.

EXHIBIT B

THE THREAT GROWS

The President's new five-man committee to investigate living costs is linked directly to organized labor's developing drive to crack the Little Steel formula and win wage increases not now permitted by the anti-inflationary stabilization program.

All available statistical studies make it abundantly clear that living costs have not advanced nearly so fast or so far as the income of unionized workers, but some weeks ago a labor victory committee complained to Mr. Roosevelt that such studies—specifically the cost-of-living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics—did not reflect true conditions and that actually the workers were finding it more and more difficult to cope with rising prices.

This complaint is one reason why the new committee has been called into existence. Another reason—the more important of the two—is that the C. I. O., aided and abetted by the A. F. of L. and encouraged by the Government's soft and self-contradictory policy in the coal-strike "settlement," has begun to press for wage boosts greater than those allowed by the Little Steel formula, the first demand being for an increase of at least 15 cents an hour for the Nation's steel workers. Presumably the President's cost-of-living inquiry, to be conducted by five members of the War Labor Board, will seek to determine whether such demands are justified in the light of the present structure of consumer prices and whether that structure has been described with reasonable accuracy by agencies like the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The time allotted for this is 60 days, during which the unions, it is assumed, will hold their fire, thus letting the present stabilization program stand at least until January.

The outlook is no more promising than that. Both the C. I. O. and A. F. of L. are reported to be ready to demand wage increases of 10 percent, or if not that, a compromise figure of 6 or 7 percent. And if they should get it, upward adjustments would be required for all the Nation's workers, adding perhaps as much as \$5,000,000,000 of "dangerous money" to the annual income of wage earners. The inflationary threat implicit in this is too obvious to need elaboration.

More than a committee to study living costs will be needed to head off this danger; to meet it, Congress and the administration together will have to be much tougher and much more farsighted in respect to it than they have been up to now.

EXHIBIT C

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, November 8.—It was a foregone conclusion that, on appeal to Washington, Joseph Curran, the president of the National Maritime Union, would be permanently excused from the armed forces and relieved of all risks of that second front in France for which he and other soap-box "commandos" of the Communist Party have been clamoring. In recognition of his valuable services in furtherance of the conspiracy to seize the American merchant marine, Mr. Curran has been placed in II-A by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, who acted by order of President Roosevelt. The

case went to the President on appeal by the union, which is to say on appeal by Curran himself, because he runs the union, after appeal board No. 4 had overruled a deferment granted by local board 18. Meanwhile, of course, other clients of local board 18, lacking Curran's political influence at the White House and the correct ideology, are off in the fighting forces, some of them, no doubt, in battle.

Curran's slogan and the basis on which his indispensability was based is that he keeps them sailing by sending other men to sea through the agency of the union. That many of those who do go to sea as civilian merchant sailors have been draft dodgers attracted by the high wages, some of the officers of the Navy's armed guard or gun crews will testify with disgust, if they are assured that they will not be identified until the war is over and they are safe from political persecution by the pro-Communist authority in Washington.

Thus, the Navy Department protects the Navy's enemies and punishes officers who would like to tell about the loading of union sailors and the heckling and harassment of enlisted men by sea-going civilians. One such officer recently told of taking a stand when his vessel was attacked and threatening to shoot any member of the crew who tried to put a boat over and abandon the ship without orders while his own bluejackets stood by their guns. He recalled also the refusal of a young merchant sailor to help his men load ammunition because that was not his work, and the incident aboard a transport in which the merchant crew knocked off at quitting time and took the winch controls into seclusion with them so that the Army could not scab their job of unloading stores which were needed in a hurry by soldiers fighting the Japs not far away had been related independently by two young officers—one of the Navy, the other of the Army—back from the South Pacific. In fact, the files of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the shipping companies contain a rich and racy record of the conduct and attitude of unionized civilians in the war zones in contrast with the disciplined loyalty of the armed forces.

The secret of the contrast may be found in the oath which is forced upon sailors of the merchant service which runs as follows:

"I solemnly swear to be true and loyal to the union and the labor cause and to put into practice the principles laid down by the preamble and the constitution, and to obey all rules the union may adopt." The enlisted sailors and commissioned officers of the Navy, of course, swear to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America above all others.

Under this oath, the merchant sailor makes himself liable to fines and to dismissal from the sea if he condemns communism and, in a notable case, a man actually was put on the beach in New York and fired from an Army transport at that, because he had offered a resolution against communism in a convention of Curran's union in Cleveland.

And, although Mr. Curran gets his deferment for keeping 'em sailing and although many new American ships have been turned over to the British, Norwegians, and Dutch because we could not man them, this union, through its own private system of kangaroo courts, regularly grinds out sentences which rule sailors off the sea for periods of from 6 months to 99 years or life for conduct unbecoming a union member which may be only an anti-Communist remark, impoliteness to a Communist union official, or some familiar manifestation of racial disharmony.

At one recent meeting 13 sailors were beached for varying periods, at another 2 were laid up and at another 11 were subtracted from the merchant service, most of them for conduct unbecoming to union men.

Mr. Curran constantly boasts that he has raised the civilian sailors' wages enormously, but the union just as vigorously resents reminders that the men are paid vastly more than the bluejackets who sail on the same ships and share the same perils.

The union is much embarrassed by references to draft dodging and therefore one brother recently was expelled from the union, because, among other offenses, he was alleged to have said he was not interested in the union and would not be at sea now had it not been for the draft board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a summary of the purposes and objectives of the bill, H. R. 3556, creating an Army and Navy Maintenance Corps, introduced by myself on October 27, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE]? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FRANCO'S NEUTRALITY—SEVERE RELATIONS WITH HIM

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to pay a high and deserved tribute to our eminent Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, because of his distinguished performance at Moscow, resulting in the Moscow Pact, the Four Power Pact. I believe that America owes our Secretary of State a real debt of gratitude. In a parliament a cabinet member returning from such a triumph would be given a stirring welcome. We do not have that practice in this country. I would that we had such a practice. Nevertheless the Secretary of State, having been once a Member of this House, has the privilege of this floor, and I hope that the Speaker of the House and others in authority might extend an invitation to the Secretary of State to enter this Chamber, where I am sure he would be most welcome and where the Members of this House would be most happy to offer him the genuine and sincere praise for a rare statesmanship exemplified particularly at Moscow.

Despite what I say in praise of the Secretary of State, we nevertheless cannot remain uncritical of some of the things that are happening. All wisdom does not reside within the State Department, and I may say that some of the good things that have emanated from the State Department have been the result of its being stung in criticism. The State Department has not taken unkindly to some of the things that may have been said of it and which have been of a constructive character. No matter how highly we regard our Secretary of State, we would be derelict in our duty as we see it, if we would not at times highlight our disagreements with certain policies formulated. Even a loving wife may call to task a loving husband. Even a fly may sting a stately horse. Only on the anvil of discussion may the truth be known. In such light I desire

you consider my remarks on Franco and his Falange.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think it would be helpful if we had the same system they have in England; namely, having the members of the Cabinet appear before Parliament or the legislative body and discuss what is being done?

Mr. CELLER. I am in hearty accord with that procedure and particularly when we remember that the State Department is the only department under the Constitution that need not render a report to the Congress. For the latter reason we know less about the State Department than we do of any other department. The President delivers messages often in person to Congress. The State Department is immune.

I would that that provision of the Constitution were wiped away so that we would have the privilege of hearing the Secretary of State perhaps in executive session, in camera, if public necessity demands, explain to us some of the intricacies of his Department and some of his difficulties and some of his policies and the execution or failure of execution thereof. It would go a long way toward establishing better public relations than have heretofore existed between the American public and the State Department.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is often difficult to have the Committee on Foreign Affairs meet with the representatives of the State Department.

Mr. CELLER. I think that would be a halfway measure only to have the members of the lady's committee hear the representatives of the State Department, difficult as that presently may be. I do not think it goes far enough. I think more frequently, probably, the Secretary of State might well meet with the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs or even the full membership of the House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman will find that the new Under Secretary of State will appear before our committee more often.

Mr. CELLER. I hope that we more humble Members of the House also may have the benefit of that enlightenment the Under Secretary gives to the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The distinguished gentlemen of the Committee on the Judiciary should certainly have that privilege.

Mr. CELLER. I am very happy to hear that.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman does not know about it, I understand that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has introduced a bill, the details of which I do not know, which would, I believe, accomplish what the gentleman from New York is talking

about; that is, it would bring the various Cabinet members before the House for interrogation. It would not compel them to come before the House, because I do not believe we can do that under our constitutional system, but questions would be submitted to them from the floor and they would answer them, except as to those questions about which on account of the war they decided it was best not to have a public discussion.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The idea conveyed in the Kefauver resolution is praiseworthy.

I wish to offer some friendly observations, with no desire whatever to dictate in the slightest degree our foreign policy against Franco and the Spanish Falange. Be it remembered that Franco maintains on the Russian front, directly or indirectly, a so-called Blue Division with a number of thousands of Spanish men. He keeps those men on the Russian front fighting our stanch and brave ally, Russia. Russia has been bled white in this war. She has lost several millions of her people. Those saintly sacrifices are in part for our benefit. Every soldier shot by members of the Blue Division maintained in Russia by Franco to that extent weakens our own cause, the cause of the United States. It is to my mind no different from shooting one of our own men.

This man Franco made a commercial agreement recently with the papier maché leader of the Italian Government, Mussolini. He has offered best wishes to Hitler only recently for Hitler's ultimate triumph over the Allied Nations, over the United States. Madrid is a pipe line of intelligence clear to Berlin. All the convoy movements, all our troop and ship movements past the bottleneck of Gibraltar and into the Mediterranean are known within 24 hours or less to Hitler, as a result of that pipe line of intelligence to Berlin. He had the temerity within the last few days to felicitate José Laurel, head of the Jap puppet government in the Philippines. Of course, this is not surprising, because in word and deed Franco is a Fascist terrorist and has always opposed the democracies, including the democracy of the United States. However, in the light of these felicitations to this Japanese puppet ruling over the Philippines, what can General MacArthur say, what can General Wainwright say, who is now a Japanese prisoner suffering, very likely, the tortures of the damned. What can the loved ones of the thousands of our troops who went through the valley of the shadow of death in the Philippines say when they read of these words of congratulation offered by Franco to José Laurel.

In a way our toleration, our coddling, our truckling to Franco, who thus espouses the causes of our enemies, is too shocking. It must summarily cease.

At the present moment Franco's most effective role is running the Fascist fifth column in Latin America against the United States, against us. His agents are found everywhere in South and Central America, poisoning the minds of the

natives against us. He is causing immeasurable trouble to the United States, particularly in Ramirez' Argentina. In the meanwhile, on top of all this, which is beyond my simple comprehension, we have our own Ambassador at Madrid offering paeans of praise to Franco. We have appeased Franco time out of hand. We sent him petroleum, we sent him cotton, we even sent him 1 ton of quinine that is so badly needed in the malaria-infested zones in the Far East. Thousands of our soldiers coveted and needed that quinine which was sent to Franco. We paid him blackmail to keep him "neutral," "neutral" according to Franco's peculiar connotation of "neutral." It is a fine sort of neutrality. This sort of back-scratching praise of Carlton Hayes, our Ambassador, must cease. It has to cease. If not, we might well crack his knuckles.

When a man puts a broomstick between my legs to trip me and then thumbs his nose at me, and then throws mud at me, as Franco did the United States, it is time to call a halt. In common parlance, I am for giving a hotfoot to Franco and the Falange. I would even go so far as to sever diplomatic relations with Spain. That is my humble opinion.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that our State Department accorded recognition to Franco within 24 hours after he captured the city of Madrid, and arranged for the advance of a credit of \$25,000,000 to Franco's government within 2 weeks thereafter.

Mr. CELLER. I think in the light of subsequent events even the State Department regrets its action in that regard. Certainly I regret that action on the part of the State Department and I am sure the gentleman does.

Call it global war, call it people's war, call it World War No. 2, whatever non-committal label we affix to it we know the issue to be that of freemen everywhere against tyranny.

That as a nation we were slow to grasp its meaning, of its coolly calculated growth in the proving grounds that were Manchuria, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Spain, in no way indicated our approval. With disastrous myopia, cured by Pearl Harbor, we failed to understand that in the very nature of nazism it could not keep itself within the confines of the land that gave it birth. It could no more be caged than one can keep a stench in a closet. Its trumpeters blared forth the prophecy of world conquest, and to make good its boast caused the hand of brother to be raised against brother, divided house against house—and then stepped into the breach. Chamberlain's pathetic "Peace in our time" bore no relevancy to the truth.

We know now that there could be no peace so long as the cancer remained alive anywhere, even in Spain. Where-soever and in whomsoever it flourishes, there we meet the foe, in Quisling Nor-

way, Vichy France, Ramirez Argentina, or in Franco Spain.

At first we believed there was no price too high to pay for Spain's neutrality. We wooed her with cotton credits, with gasoline, with wheat, meat, rubber. We turned aside when a gang of Fascist students from the University of Madrid stoned the American Embassy. The pro-Nazi antidemocracies' pronouncements in the press and official speeches went on without let or hindrance. Anti-American posters were freely displayed in Madrid. We sent a million and a half dollars' worth of flour, dried and condensed milk, and medicine to Franco Spain, paid for out of a congressional appropriation to the Red Cross for the relief of war-stricken countries. But our gesture of good will was not permitted to be seen by the Spanish people. The trucks transporting the gift bore nothing to indicate they were from the Red Cross or even from the United States. These markings were painted on later, but they were so small that it was barely possible to see the Red Cross and impossible without close examination to see that it was the American rather than the Spanish Red Cross that was responsible. The Spanish Army, which provided trucks to move the food from Cadiz to Seville, loaded the sacks with the side bearing the inscription "Gift of the American people to the people of Spain" turned down. It was part of the agreement that the Franco press should give plenty of space to our gift, but the truth is that the Nazis obtained more publicity for their offer, which, incidentally, they never fulfilled, to aid the victims of a fire at Santander in the summer of 1941, than we have from all our appeasement efforts since the end of the civil war, not even for the whole ton of quinine we so graciously let them have—quinine so urgently needed by our lads in the Far East.

The press continued to pour forth its vituperations against the United Nations and it was not until we became tough and demanded from Spain in return such vital materials as cork and tungsten ore that we at last embarked on a realistic course of behavior. It was our gasoline embargo that finally resulted in proving to Franco Spain that we no longer chose to play the role of beseecher, of the seeker of favors. Since we now buy from Franco more than we sell him, the question of further credits no longer exists.

But Franco must be convinced that in any of our relationships with him we are acting in the interests of an Allied victory, not because we are frightened of him or that we approve. Franco Spain and the United Nations are terms mutually exclusive.

And thus it is that we cannot afford to sit back with smugness, assured that the situation is well in hand. We must get tough with Franco. There still remains the anomalous situation of our little get togethers with Franco Spain on the one hand and the evil-reeking Blue Division of Spain fighting on the eastern front against our ally, Russia, on the other.

With the invasion by Hitler of Russia in June 1941, the Blue Division of volunteers was formed and left for the Russian front. Russia is our ally. She is being bled white in her valiant advance against the Nazi hordes, our common foe. Yet Franco continues to maintain against the Russians his Blue Legion of Spaniards who oppose the Russians every inch of their arduous way. Certainly the killing of Russian soldiers by Franco's men can hardly be regarded as a neutral activity by any stretch of the imagination.

True, the press carried reports on October 14 that it had received reliable diplomatic information that Franco had already withdrawn the Blue Division and that it had arrived in Spain. There is no explanation, of course, of why one recent broadcast reported that Gen. Esteban Infantes, the division's present commander, had been given the Iron Cross, nor why the regular Blue Division news broadcast by Celia Jimenez continues to come out of Berlin, nor why the Radio Madrid continues its regular Falange broadcast giving Blue Division casualties. But there is a growing suspicion abroad that the Blue Division will gradually be changed into a foreign legion fighting under the German flag, thus giving Franco to play his neat little double-dealing game. The dissolution of Franco's Blue Division will be the seemingly humble response to United Nations pressure and the Foreign Legion of Spaniards will be the salute to Hitler.

Franco has uttered no "a plague on both your houses." Of all Europe, it is "neutral" Franco who has contributed the largest single anti-Soviet foreign unit to Hitler's eastern forces. It originally was created with about 18,000 men, including 2,000 military students from Spain. There is no accurate way of estimating how many thousands of Spanish Falangists passed through it, saw enough action to get some basic war training, and then were shipped back to Spain. Latest estimates place the number of men in Russia at 10,000—10,000 "neutrals."

Remember the Scriptures provide us with a stirring phrase, "He who is not with me is against me."

Franco has not feared in spite of his professed neutrality, to advertise his product. The Division wears Spanish uniforms with German insignia sewn on and the Spanish monarchical colors, red and gold, on the right sleeve. The word "Espana" is included. The war has produced many incongruous situations, made strange bedfellows, indeed, but none more at cross purposes than a neutral country asking and receiving from one set of belligerents the materials it vitally needs and then sending its soldiers to fight under the insignia of the opposing set of belligerents. Treachery shows many countenances, the snarling and the urbane, but the most incomprehensible, I believe, is the spectacle of Franco's bleating before the council of the Falange his determination that Spain shall stand aside from the world conflict. I know a number of 14-year-old Americans who would reply, "Whom does he think he's kidding?"

What Franco terms the "Holy Crusade" against the Communist bogey has received its most shattering blow in the joint four-nation declaration, the Moscow Pact. They have united in a common pledge "to secure the liberation of themselves and the peoples allied with them from the menace of aggression." The hope of the Axis to disunite the United Nations by screaming of the Bolshevik menace is blasted. With the signing of the pact, the emotionalism that attended the waving of the "red herring" must dissipate, and the most convenient weapon of the Axis in setting brother against brother will have lost its strength. The fear made so much of by the Axis propaganda machine that Russia would control the making of the peace is now without foundation. No excuse whatsoever exists either on moral or ethical grounds for the maintaining of the Blue Division on the eastern front. It has to go. Do you want it to go? I am sure you do.

The massive victories of the Red Army in Russia, the smashing British-American invasion of Italy, the pulverizing air attacks on the Reich, and the constantly mounting strength of the United Nations in every particular have all combined to make the Spanish dictatorship an uneasy one. Fully 40,000 Spanish guerrillas recruited from civil war veterans and youth groups conduct open warfare against Franco with machine guns and mortars. He is losing his grip on his own army officers. Frankly the bell of doom may be tolling for Franco as it did for Mussolini and as it will for Hitler. We must make that warning a siren's shriek. There is little doubt as the tide of victory rises, Franco will make a bid, basing that bid on his neutrality, for Allied favor, will try to jump on the bandwagon. Then it is we must again proceed warily.

It will be remembered that he praised Hitler and Mussolini, that he gloated with their early victories, that he is in command in Spain because Hitler and Mussolini willed it, not the people; that he spied against us, lending aid and comfort to the enemy in blatant, boastful manner. The meaning of the coalition now ranging itself against him in and out of Spain is clear. The starved, the beaten, the interned in Spain knew that the fight for freedom everywhere is a fight for their freedom as well. The rumblings of the freemen of Spain are heard above the dictatorial mouthings and Franco stirs uneasily. I fear he has bad dreams.

Soberly and in humility of spirit, without the bitterness of vengeance, we watch the death throes of fascism with the realization that to win the peace, fascism, nazi-ism, and falangism must be completely and thoroughly eradicated. Wherever it remains or is allowed to remain, it will be an eddying pool, spreading in all directions; it will be the spot of decay infecting as it touches. The lives of the young, the gallant, the free, and the brave must not have been given in vain.

In view of the dastardly character of recent acts of Franco—the Blue Division in Russia, his spies in Latin America, the commercial agreement with Mussolini,

the congratulations of José Laurel—I humbly petition officialdom that our diplomatic relations be forthwith severed.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the expiration of all business on the Speaker's desk and special orders as of record, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD EMPLOYEES AND THEIR WAGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] for 15 minutes.

THE STABILIZATION DIRECTOR'S "BIG STEAL" WAGE POLICY

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recent developments indicate that under the affectionate care and paternal guidance of statistically minded bureaucrats the War Labor Board's Little Steel wage formula has grown up to be the Stabilization Director's "big steal" wage policy.

Both formulas and policies, however, have definite antisocial aspects that cannot be concealed by all the patriotic browbeating that has surrounded their infamous existence. This is found in the fact that they hold wages to 15 percent while living costs have mounted much higher, thereby lowering the living standards of some American workers, already underpaid, to still lower levels that border on pauperism.

STATISTICS REVEAL PAINFUL INCREASES IN COST OF LIVING

The Bureau of Labor Statistics cost-of-living figures, recently found unreliable by a distinguished committee of economists and educators, show an over-all increase of living costs of 23 percent and an increase of food well in excess of 40 percent. Here we have unreliable Government statistics showing a 40-percent increase in the price of food that the Stabilization Director wants met with a 15-percent increase in wages. But that is not half the story. These figures fail to show the evil effects of the nationwide food black markets which have become a national disgrace. They fail to show the reduced quality of the many items entering the cost of living. They fail to show many other factors well known to every housewife in every town and community in America, but smugly disregarded by our percentage jugglers.

SACRIFICES ARE UNEQUAL

The pious prattle of our bickering bureaucrats that all our people are making equal patriotic sacrifices is pure unadulterated nonsense. The more fortunate few in the upper brackets may be forced at times to take fried chicken when they prefer sirloin steak, but they are not actually going hungry. With railroad wage earners, paid as low as 46 cents an hour, the story is altogether different.

UNDERLYING FACTORS ANENT RAILWAY WAGE ADJUSTMENTS

When considering the War Labor Board's Little Steel wage award in its

relation to the present railroad wage dispute it is important that several underlying and closely related factors be kept in mind. Among these are:

First. The Little Steel award fixed a minimum of 78 cents an hour for common unskilled labor in the steel industry.

Second. The report of the President's Emergency Board filed with the President under date of May 24, found that of 1,097,180 railroad workers employed as of October 1942 and involved in the wage dispute—

about one-half of these workers—544,106, or 49.6 percent—received less than 70 cents an hour; 411,684, or 37.5 percent, received less than 60 cents an hour; 255,813, or 23.3 percent, received less than 55 cents an hour; 160,438, or 14.6 percent, received less than 50 cents an hour; 104,269 received the prevailing minimum rate of 46 cents an hour, and 16,871 received less than 46 cents an hour.

Third. In the railroad labor dispute the President's Emergency Board reported that—

The average earnings of the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees involved in this dispute, embodying skilled, semi-skilled, and nonskilled workers, as of October 1942, were 73.8 cents an hour.

This was 4.2 cents less than the 78 cents fixed by the War Labor Board in its Little Steel formula for common unskilled labor in the steel industry.

Fourth. Following the application of the Little Steel wage award, and as a result of its effect upon wages in the steel industry, the average hourly earnings of all workers in the steel industry in October 1942 was \$1.077 per hour according to National Industrial Conference Board figures. This was 23.9 cents above the 73.8-cent average for the million nonoperating railroad workers.

HOURLY PAY DISPARITIES

There is no justification for one Government agency fixing a 78-cent minimum for common labor in the steel industry while another Government agency cancels a wage increase for railroad workers who receive much lower rates of pay. There is no justification for paying highly skilled mechanics in the railroad industry less than the overall average for the steel industry as a whole, including its common labor. How can the Government justify itself when it establishes a 78-cent hourly minimum for common labor in the steel industry and then quibbling about an 8-cent hourly increase for skilled railroad carpenters who only receive 74 cents an hour.

PACIFIC ELECTRIC WAGE CASE

In his October 25 approval of the Pacific Electric wage case the Stabilization Director clearly indicates that his wage conclusions are not to be based upon the factors set forth in the Stabilization Act nor upon all the factors embraced even in the Little Steel formula. He has become "15 percent minded" to such an extent that he is apparently becoming blinded to the evil effects of existing wage inequities and wage inequalities. In his Pacific Electric statement he frankly admits that the cornerstone of his wage

policy was the general rule of not granting wage increases.

He frankly admits there is not a proper balance in some wage scales as compared with others but complacently dismisses this unstable economic factor with the fatalistic observation that there never was and probably never will be. He continues with the equally unstable reasoning that his freezing of wage rates will not result in inequalities any greater than those which existed before he climbed upon his dictatorial throne. Thus, the Stabilization Director builds his stabilization program on the preservation and perpetuation of wage instability.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. Is it the gentleman's opinion, with which I agree, with O. P. A. failing to hold the price, and with profits appearing to be unlimited by reason of no obligation, excepting renegotiation, that now it remains singularly true that labor itself has been isolated in its right to petition for relief by the arbitrary awards of the War Labor Board?

Mr. COFFEE. I agree thoroughly, and thank the gentleman for his contribution.

RAILROADS PROSPEROUS NOW

The railroads of the United States are enjoying the most prosperous period in their history. The first 8 months of 1943 showed gross revenue of class I railroads of the United States increased 28 percent over the corresponding period in 1942. During the same 8 months in 1943, the net revenue of these railroads increased 41 percent over the net revenue they secured in 1942 for the corresponding period. In the first two-thirds of 1943 the net earnings, after taxes of the railroads, increased 30 percent over their net earnings in the same period in 1942. In the full year 1942 the gross revenues of class I railroads of the United States passed the \$7,000,000,000 mark, or the peak year in all history. This prodigious amount is one and one-fourth billion dollars higher than the peak year 1929 when the railroads enjoyed the greatest gross revenues of any year up to that date or since that date to the year 1942 in American history. These are statistics that are irrefutable and should give us pause.

STARTLING DISPARITIES IN HOURLY PAY

The top scale hourly pay received by the skilled mechanics employed on American railroads is 95 cents. This is the per hour compensation given machinists, blacksmiths, and so forth. On most railroads carpenters receive but 74 cents per hour, yet, beginning welders in shipyards and aircraft factories draw \$1.15 per hour. In many war plants an unskilled worker receives as high as \$1.40 per hour. Think of the effect upon the spirit of a skilled worker who has spent 10 to 30 years in his profession and has finally attained the top grade of 95 cents per hour, noting that a high-school girl in a war plant is being paid higher hourly remuneration than he obtains. When it comes to the highly skilled mechanics in

war plants, the hourly pay is invariably 50 to 100 percent higher than that paid to railroad workers in the same category. Yet, railroad workers are compelled to spend the same amount for grocery bills, insurance, and taxes as those receiving much higher wages.

All of us sincerely hope and pray that it will not be necessary for railroad employees to go out on strike, nor to resort to any drastic steps to secure long overdue adjustments in their pay on a fair and reasonable scale, which is all that they request. I deplore the denial to these men of their just desserts.

WE SHOULD ELIMINATE WAGE INEQUITIES

The railroad workers do not object to good wages being paid the employees in war industries, but they feel that their own should be adjusted upward, to enable them to be placed more on a parity with such workers. Even without considering the high rates paid in war industry and the seasonal industries, such as building construction, railroad employees still receive considerably lower wage rates than comparable groups in outside industries. Wage rates in outside industries, even with the exclusion of the exceptionally high rates, are on the average approximately 10 cents per hour higher than the railroad workers.

In July 1942, more than one-fourth of all common laborers in the United States were paid at starting rates of 75 cents or more, per hour. It can be seen then that 1 out of every 4 adult, male, unskilled workers received a rate of pay higher than the 73 classes of railroad employees, which include skilled, semi-skilled workers, as well as common laborers. Only 8 months after Pearl Harbor, in the Little Steel case, the National War Labor Board fixed the minimum rate of pay in the steel industry for common labor at 78 cents per hour, which is considerably in excess of the average hourly earnings of the 73 classes of nonoperating railroad employees, including skilled and semiskilled workers. Why not treat the railroad employees in comparable fashion?

The prayer of these underpaid railway workers should be granted now. Why penalize the most faithful essential skilled war workers in America by denying them minimum justice in the matter of wage adjustments? I plead for action consistent with the dynamics of a changing age.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. I would like to make this observation. The gentleman has just said that he is hopeful that the railroad workers will not strike. That strikes me as somewhat similar to the statement that I made in the Well of the House concerning the coal miners last May. I said at that time that it was possible to break the morale and the will of the coal miners by continually keeping them under subnormal wages, and, likewise, it appears to be the same thing applies to railroads at this time. Our best wishes are that they will not contribute to the difficulty of our country while in

war by going on strike, but unless the War Labor Board and this Government listen to their petition that is exactly what will happen, and they will not be at fault. It seems to me that some of the older Members of the House ought to bring forth some legislation whereby all these categories of wage earners who do not fall directly in the war effort should not fall under the direction of the War Labor Board until their wage has at least reached a level comparable with the wage of ordinary workers in war industry.

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman, and I understand that such a measure is now under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the five transportation brotherhoods, representing the engine, train, and yard services of the railroads of the United States, embracing 350,000 workers in number, bitterly protest against what they regard as a trifling 4-cent-per-hour increase recommended by the so-called Emergency Board. These unions had asked for a 30-percent raise, in order that the wages of the workers might be placed on a parity with that of other industrial employees, consistent with the substantial increase in the cost of living. The operating railroad workers presented irrefutable documentary data justifying such an increase to the Emergency Board.

Even that Board announced the men were entitled to a much higher increase than 4 cents per hour, but insisted it was stymied from awarding a greater amount by the restricted interpretation placed on the administration's wage-stabilization program by Economic Stabilizer Fred M. Vinson.

HAD REASON TO BELIEVE INCREASE WOULD BE GRANTED

The 4-cent increase was denominated an insult by the 600 general chairmen of the organizations comprising the operating railroad employees at a 2-day conference recently in Chicago. The issue was ordered to the membership via a strike referendum. This was embarked upon only as a last resort. The railroad brotherhoods have been working for months to obtain justice on wages for their members. The representatives of the railway unions had been repeatedly told that they could expect to be granted a reasonable increase, but just when they had grounds for believing the compromise increase would be ratified, all such previous commitments were repudiated.

Although the Emergency Board found on the record that the employees involved in the dispute had made out an impressive case for a wage increase to eliminate gross inequities and, further, in the interest of more efficient prosecution of the war, indicated it was just that they should receive such an increase, they nevertheless recommended that the employees involved receive but 4 cents an hour increase, effective as of April 1.

LITTLE STEEL FORMULA ASPECTS

The Board based its allowance of such an infinitesimal adjustment upon the so-called Little Steel formula. The railroad employees are exacerbated by this decision. The misnamed Little Steel formula

denies justice to the workers and should be revised in the interest of equity and fair play. It should be remembered that the cost of living to the railroad worker requires the expenditure of practically all of his income, whereas the cost of living to people of higher income requires the outlay of but a small percentage of their income. The cost of living has gone up a minimum of 42 percent, which is the major item embraced in the presented case of the railroad workers. By denying a reasonable increase to the 350,000 operating employees of the railroads, these highly skilled and very intelligent employees are left no funds with which to invest in household furnishings and other items which go into the general cost of living. These employees have a difficult time in setting aside any money with which to purchase War bonds and stamps, donating to the Red Cross, Community War Chests, and so forth.

These five brotherhoods affected have sedulously endeavored to get a square deal for their men for 10 months and have exercised the utmost patience during all of that time.

A SEATTLE CASE IN POINT

Every day food prices are going higher, yet the men have not been given their wage increases. Here is a typical case of injustice, as practiced on one individual: In Seattle, Wash., a Pullman conductor works on his railroad 240 hours a month. His gross monthly wage is \$196, net \$150, after deductions. This conductor has a next-door neighbor, not a skilled worker, but who, prior to his employment in a war plant, had no experience in such a job. If this neighbor works in the shipyards, at a job requiring no skill, for the same number of hours as the Pullman conductor, he will draw \$360 as compensation therefor. To me it is absurd and ridiculous that such disparities are not recognized. A high-school girl, as an apprentice welder in a war plant, draws \$1.15 per hour.

EDITORIAL IN LABOR

In the current issue of Labor, a publication of the Railway Brotherhoods and a beautifully edited and well-conducted publication, there appears an interesting editorial, which I quote.

RAIL WAGE CASE UP TO MR. ROOSEVELT—WILL HE TREAT THE WORKERS AS HE WOULD BUSINESSMEN WHO MADE AN EQUALLY IMPRESSIVE SHOWING?

If businessmen, engaged in the production of vital war supplies, were to go to the White House, appealing for higher prices, and were able to show that costs had gone up to such an extent that they could not "break even," what would happen?

Would the President turn them away on the ground that, if their request were granted, the Nation would be involved in devastating inflation? Would the newspapers denounce them as unpatriotic?

Of course, not. Mr. Roosevelt would immediately start the machinery to assure the businessmen fair treatment and every newspaper in the land would applaud him.

In saying this we are not indulging in wild guesses. We all know that before businessmen consented to touch war contracts they were permitted to "write their own ticket," so far as the prices were concerned, and Con-

gress pushed through a tax bill which met with their approval.

In fact, their profits have been so huge that for months the Government has been renegotiating contracts, saving billions for the Treasury, but leaving the businessmen such a wide margin that responsible Government officials insist they will have surpluses totaling \$50,000,000,000 after the war is over.

Railroad labor is not asking anything like that. It is requesting an extremely modest wage increase, in order that rail workers, who are doing an extraordinary job in this war emergency, may be able to keep pace with soaring prices, increased taxes, and the urgent demand that they help finance the war.

Why shouldn't railroad workers be treated with something like the consideration that President Roosevelt and his lieutenants would promptly display if businessmen were presenting an equally persuasive case?

As labor sees it, this railroad wage issue is now on the desk of the President of the United States. He can dispose of it in 48 hours. All that is necessary is a little common sense applied in a spirit of fair play.

SENIORITY, LOYALTY, MORALE INVOLVED

It takes years for the average operating employee of a railroad to attain a seniority rating, assuring him of continuation of employment. This seniority is a coveted possession, for which the railroad worker struggles long and assiduously. It is the principal factor which encourages him to remain at work on railroads, despite disparity in wage income with skilled employment in war industries, such as shipyard workers, aircraft factories, munitions, etc. It has been my experience that these railroad workers have never asked for any unfair increase of remuneration or improvement in working conditions. They seek justice only. I beseech the administration to act now and take steps to insure that these men get the compromise wage settlement they have heretofore accepted, but which, at the eleventh hour, was denied them. Do not undermine the morale of railroad workers. The business life of this Government is geared to the efficiency of railroads. They have been overworked, they have been compelled to operate their freight trains overloaded with freight, and passenger trains overloaded with passengers. Old equipment is being employed, even the most inferior types—roadbeds are being overused. Under the strain and impact of war, the same safety precautions cannot be employed to the fullest extent, as compared with normal times. Hence, the railroad workers today are subjected to greater hazards and are putting in much harder work during the hours they are employed. They are a patriotic group. They have given generously of their sons and their brothers to the armed services. They have bought tremendous amounts of War bonds. It seems to me we are reaching an unfortunate state of affairs when one bureaucrat, heretofore identified with the judiciary, can substitute his own judgment for that of the combined and considered opinion of those most conversant with the problem—when one official can obdurately undo the agreement between management and labor representatives. Such an arbitrary pronouncement of a

mere 4-cent increase is not consonant with the spirit nor traditions of democratic government. Let us accord justice to the 350,000 men who comprise the operating employees of the railroads of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter and also a table of figures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution relating to the tenure of office of the present President and Vice President of the Philippines.

CONTINUATION OF GOVERNMENT OF PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 189, to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain the joint resolution?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the law in the Philippines provides that the term of President Quezon ends on the 15th of November 1943, and that the Vice President shall succeed him as President. The purpose of this resolution is to continue things in status quo until such time as the President of the United States shall issue a proclamation that constitutional processes have been restored in the Philippine Islands. At the present time the gentleman of course knows that the Philippines have been overrun by the Japanese, and that they are in control. The legislative branch of the Philippine Government and the judicial branch of the Philippine Government are prisoners to Japan. The only government the islands have is the Government which is in existence here in the city of Washington. That is the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand this resolution is recommended by the Army and the State Department. I would like the gentleman to tell us whether or not the administration has recommended the joint resolution. Has the President asked this bill be passed in view of the fact that it changes the Constitution of the Philippine Commonwealth Government. I was wondering whether or not it had the unanimous approval of the President of the United States and the State Department and the Department of Justice.

Mr. BELL. I will be glad to answer the gentleman's inquiry. I hold in my hand a letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and also to myself as chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives. This letter is signed by the President of the Philippines, by the Vice President, by the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, by the Secretary of National Defense, by the Secretary of Information on Public Relations, the Secretary of Finance, the Auditor General, and the secretary to the President. Those signing this letter requesting this action, constitute not only the President and Vice President of the Philippines, but also all of their cabinet and all of the responsible officials, you might say, of the executive department of the Philippine Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand that all Philippine officials who are here have agreed upon this, but I would like the gentleman to reply to my question, whether or not our administration has sanctioned that action.

Mr. BELL. If the gentleman will give me time, I will do that. I have a letter from the Department of State, signed by the Acting Secretary of State. He calls attention to this resolution which is before us at this moment. The last paragraph of the letter is very short and I will read it:

The Department of State has been asked to comment on this proposal, and I desire to state in connection with the request that the Department is in sympathy with the purpose of the legislation.

Sincerely yours.

It is signed by Mr. Stettinius, Acting Secretary.

Perhaps you will be interested in what the War Department thinks, so I will also call your attention to the fact that I have a letter from Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, addressed to me as chairman of this committee. The letter is short and I will read it:

I have read the proposed joint resolution, No. 189, to provide for the continuation of the Government of the Philippine Islands, and hasten to advise you that in my opinion the passage of this resolution will greatly assist in the continuance and effective prosecution of the war effort to liberate the Philippines from Japan. I hope it may be adopted by both Houses promptly.

I might say for the gentleman's information that during the morning the other House adopted this resolution, I understand unanimously.

Mr. STEFAN. But I understand, however, that is not in the form as written in the House committee.

Mr. BELL. It is identical in form with this resolution.

Mr. STEFAN. Was the Tydings bill similar to this one?

Mr. BELL. Some days ago, Senator TYDINGS introduced a similar resolution to this, but this morning or yesterday he introduced a facsimile of this resolution.

The one that was passed by the Senate this morning is identical with the one that is before the House at this time.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Has there been anything direct from the President of the United States on this particular bill? Has he recommended the passage of this bill?

Mr. BELL. I have no direct communication from the President of the United States, but I do have a communication from the Department of State and the War Department.

Mr. STEFAN. You would assume the Department of State was talking for the President, would you not?

Mr. BELL. I do not know what the gentleman would assume. He may assume whatever he wishes.

Mr. STEFAN. This is a very important piece of legislation. It changes the Constitution of the Philippine Government, Mr. Speaker. However, others wish to discuss it. It should be well discussed so we will know what is being done. For that reason I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the House should be advised of the circumstances which justify speedy action on this measure, and I would appreciate the gentleman explaining that.

Mr. BELL. I am glad the gentleman brought up that question. As you know from the statement I made a few moments ago, the term of office of the present President of the Philippines expires on November 15. That is next Monday. Unless we take action upon this matter immediately, in order to give the resolution time to be adopted by both the House and the Senate, and signed by the President of the United States, it might mean that it would not become law until after that term of office had expired. So it is necessary that we have immediate action on it.

I would like to say that the purpose of this is to work out a situation where we will, before the world, have a united front in the Philippines, so that when American troops come back into the Philippines the entire Filipino people will know that all of their officials over here are united behind American effort to bring about the liberation of the Philippines. The passage of this resolution, I think I can say to the gentleman, in all probability will go a long way toward saving the lives of perhaps many thousands of American troops, because it will pave the way to a complete understanding in the Philippines as to the position of their officials who are here.

Mr. COLE of New York. When did the Committee on Insular Affairs meet to consider this bill?

Mr. BELL. Yesterday.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentleman advised as to the conditions or circumstances which caused this bill, which the gentleman has said to be so important to the welfare and the lives of 50,000 American boys, to be held up for consideration until the eleventh hour,

when those who were responsible for this bill knew of the situation for at least 12 months?

Mr. BELL. I do not, of course, know everything that has taken place in the last 12 months but I do know that on the 5th of November I received this letter from the responsible officials of the Philippine Government urging that we take this action. I know that doubtless before that time there were many conferences; at any rate that letter was presented to me and I was asked to file this resolution.

Mr. COLE of New York. I see the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines here. Perhaps he can explain why there has been this inordinate delay in anticipating a situation which was bound to develop.

Mr. ELIZALDE. I should like to answer the gentleman, although I am not quite sure whether I can give any particular reason why the presentation of such a resolution has been delayed. I may say that for more than 6 weeks at least we have been in constant negotiations here. I spoke to Senator Tydings on this matter I am sure it was 5 or 6 weeks ago and we prepared several plans and resolutions. In some cases they did not meet the approval of the members of the Government of the Philippines, and also in some cases apparently there were some objections from the executive departments. That is probably the reason why this has been delayed. I could not really give a more definite answer because I am not in position to.

Mr. COLE of New York. The resolution continues in office only the President and Vice President of the Philippines.

Mr. ELIZALDE. That is all.

Mr. COLE of New York. Are there any other Philippine Government officers whose presence in this country and whose authority is necessary along with the President and the Vice President?

Mr. ELIZALDE. The other officers can be appointed by the President; that is the cabinet; and that is all there is present here in the United States.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman means the financial officer of the Philippine Government is not here?

Mr. ELIZALDE. The auditor general is here.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is he an elected or an appointed official?

Mr. ELIZALDE. He is an appointed official.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then, the President and the Vice President are the only constitutionally elected officers of the Philippine Government who are in this country? Is that correct?

Mr. ELIZALDE. That is correct.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. The purpose of the resolution is to set aside a constitutional provision that will become effective as of the 15th day of this month; is it not?

Mr. ELIZALDE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ROWE. There is no other reason for this resolution except that?

Mr. ELIZALDE. The object is to continue in office the present government in

Washington until the time when constitutional processes in the Philippines are reestablished.

Mr. ROWE. And that does nullify this constitutional provision.

Mr. ELIZALDE. Only temporarily; only temporarily. This is a war measure; it is an emergency measure. There are a few members of the Philippine Government present in Washington at this time.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should like to ask the gentleman when the term of office of the Commissioner of the Philippine Islands terminates.

Mr. ELIZALDE. There is no definite time of termination.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is an appointive office?

Mr. ELIZALDE. That is an appointive office; the Commissioner continues in office indefinitely.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentleman convinced that this action by Congress in upsetting or modifying the terms of the basic law of the Philippine Islands will be acceptable to his own people?

Mr. ELIZALDE. I have no doubt whatsoever. I give that answer categorically to my friend from New York. I may say that I would support this measure strictly and only as an emergency measure and until the government is in a position to return to the Philippines. As soon as that happens, and I think it will, I would favor a reestablishment and continuation of the constitutional processes.

Mr. COLE of New York. As the gentleman knows, I was not in the city yesterday; I had no previous warning, nor had any other member of the Committee on Insular Affairs that this measure was to be called up. I do want the RECORD to show, however, that I maintain grave doubts of the advisability of this measure, both from the standpoint of the Filipino people and our international relations with the Philippines. I want it understood and I want to know whether the Resident Commissioner of the Philippines will agree with me, that this action by the Congress in modifying the Constitution of the Philippine Islands is not to be taken as a precedent for the future so that the enemy now in control of the Philippines can say that this is an example of American control over the Philippines for the future.

Mr. ELIZALDE. I believe that is perfectly well understood by the members of the Philippine Government here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that particular point?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join the gentleman from New York in taking the position as a Member of this House on the Democratic side and also as majority leader—I completely agree with the gentleman—that if this bill should be acted upon favorably under no circumstances should it be considered as a precedent to govern future action.

Mr. COLE of New York. The Congress, the world, the Philippines, and the Japanese Government can understand

that this measure is sought by the official spokesman of the Filipino people?

Mr. ELIZALDE. I have no objection to being placed on record on that point. I want my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] to understand that this letter suggesting this legislation was also signed by the President and the Vice President themselves; in other words the whole Government here is in full agreement, the interested parties.

Mr. COLE of New York. What I want to emphasize is that the official spokesman for the Filipino people and the Filipino Government, as heretofore elected, seek this legislation and it is approved by the officials in the United States.

Mr. ELIZALDE. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I submit a question? This is purely a war emergency measure and is not set down as a precedent for future legislation; is that true?

Mr. BELL. This is purely a war measure and the resolution itself provides that as soon as the President of the United States shall proclaim that constitutional processes and the normal functions of government have been restored in the Philippine Islands, then the Vice President goes right in as President. He immediately assumes his office of President just the same as he would if this resolution had not been passed.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. By the terms of this resolution the present term of the President of the Philippines is extended, but it does not give him the right to hold another term of office?

Mr. BELL. Oh, no.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. It extends temporarily his present term; that is all?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. In the interest of saving the lives of American boys?

Mr. BELL. It is for the purpose of saving the lives of American boys and Philippine boys that this is being done, and it is purely a stopgap thing until the constitutional government of the Philippines can be restored.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. It has the endorsement, recommendation, and approval of practically all of those in authority who are prepared to speak for the Philippine administration?

Mr. BELL. Every responsible Filipino official in America has endorsed it and has requested its passage.

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and it is not my intention to object, this resolution was considered before the Committee on Insular Affairs yesterday. It was the unanimous opinion of the members present that the adoption of the resolution under present circumstances would tend to strengthen the position of our country in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Who was present when the committee advocated the passage of this bill?

Mr. WELCH. Only members of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Was anybody from the State Department present?

Mr. WELCH. No.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The State Department must have filed some request for it.

Mr. WELCH. The request for the resolution came from the State Department, the War Department, the Interior Department, and from officials of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. BELL. I may say for the benefit of the gentleman that I have since received a letter from the State Department. I want to introduce all of these letters in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would say if the gentleman would put them in the RECORD at this point it would help.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter dated November 5, addressed to Senator MILLARD D. TYDINGS, chairman of the Senate committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would suggest that the gentleman postpone that request until his unanimous consent request for consideration of the resolution has been granted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am in sympathy with the objective sought to be achieved, but I want to ask the gentleman if he feels that the Congress has the authority to change by this act the Constitution of the Philippine Islands? It seems to me we are confronted here with a very delicate and difficult situation.

Mr. BELL. I may say to the gentleman that that question has been considered. This country has sovereignty over the Philippine Islands under existing law, and it is believed there is no question about the authority of Congress to pass this resolution. That question has been briefed and, incidentally, a brief was put in the RECORD on the Senate side about a week ago by Senator TYDINGS. In his opinion, in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of everyone who has studied the question, the Congress has unquestioned legal right to pass this resolution and make the changes required by the resolution.

Mr. MAHON. So we are on a firm basis both from the standpoint of legal right and the end to be achieved by this act.

Mr. BELL. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, if I may be permitted to propound a question to the chairman of the committee. What would be the effect of the failure of the Congress to pass such a resolution prior to the 15th of the month? Would it install legally the Vice President of the Philippines as President?

Mr. BELL. Yes, I understand it would.

Mr. COFFEE. I am advised by the Commissioner of the Philippines that

the Vice President of the Philippine Government has joined with the President and associated officials in requesting the passage of this resolution. That is a fact of which I had not been aware heretofore and I think it should be brought out for the benefit of the membership. The Vice President has joined in this request.

Mr. BELL. As I stated earlier to the gentleman, the Vice President has signed this letter.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I was not in the city yesterday because we had been assured by the majority leader there was nothing coming up on that date or this week. The special meeting of the Committee on Insular Affairs was called yesterday afternoon and I was not present, of course. As has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] it seems rather strange when this matter has been pending for so long that it could not have been taken up in the regular meetings which are constantly being held by the committee. What is the major objection to following the constitution of the Philippines as it is and allowing the Vice President to become the President as he should when the term of the President expires on November 15?

Mr. BELL. I may say to the gentleman I think the reason that both the Vice President and the President of the Philippines have joined in this request is that it is well recognized that over there, like in this country, there are different political parties, you have different personalities, and it is desired to put a united front before the Philippine people so that the people over there who are now under the domination of Japan and who cannot speak for themselves will know that all of the various parties and groups over here are united in the effort to drive out Japan and to reestablish free government in the Philippines. That is the purpose that they tell me is behind this resolution.

Mr. JUDD. I am still at a loss to understand how the passage of this resolution serves that end. Surely the retiring President will support the Vice President when he becomes President just as much as the Vice President has been supporting the present President. There would still be a united front, would there not? What reason is there to believe there would be dissension in the Philippines if we allow the constitution which we authorized, and which was written by the Filipinos and approved by them in a popular referendum, to function in its proper form? How different are we from Hitler when we say that just because it will perhaps serve our purposes better, we come along and suspend their constitution temporarily "until the President of the United States shall proclaim that constitutional processes and normal functions of government shall have been restored in the Philippine Islands"? That may be 5 or 10 years from now. I am a little apprehensive that people all over Asia are going to say that America does to the Filipinos just like the countries we are fighting do to their subject peoples.

I cannot see what serious disadvantages would result from continuing under the Philippine Constitution that has been set up in good faith and I can see very serious disadvantages in a sudden last-minute setting aside of a nation's basic constitution without hearings or debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the letter sent to Senator TYDINGS and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], signed by the President and Vice President and other officials, is probably the best answer that can be given to the gentleman's pertinent inquiry. The letter states:

Due to invasion and occupation of the Philippines by the Japanese, constitutional processes and normal functions of government have been interrupted in the Philippine Islands. While this condition prevails, the question of the presidential succession under our Constitution comes up for consideration.

If we were in the Philippines and our constitutional government there were functioning regularly, there would be no problem. But we are not in the Philippines—

That is, they are a refugee government—

we are in the midst of a global war, and our constitutional system and democratic institutions are seriously jeopardized. The operation of the legislative and judicial branches are suspended by enemy occupation and only the executive branch which remains free from the enemy's action—

And this only because it is over here—and is now temporarily established in Washington is able to continue performing its functions.

Obviously constitutional government and democratic processes will not again function in the Philippines until law and order are reestablished.

Therefore, we, the President, the Vice President, and the other members of the war cabinet of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, respectfully submit this matter to the President and the Congress of the United States with the request that they review the whole situation and take such action as in their wisdom will best serve the interest of the Filipino people, their constitutional government, and the Government of the United States during this emergency. Congress may feel free to consider whether it would be to the best interest of both peoples to allow changes in the direction of the Commonwealth government during the emergency, to continue the status quo until such time as the constitutional and democratic processes are fully reestablished in the Philippines, or to follow such other course of action as in their opinion is required by the circumstances.

Then, as I understand, they recommend this emergency legislation. I also understand that this resolution amends in a very marked respect a previous one that was introduced in that it limits it. It does not make it definite, but until such time as in the judgment of the President conditions are reestablished in the Philippines where there can be a normal functioning of the democratic processes of government.

Mr. JUDD. I think the gentleman's position as outlined in that letter would

be defensible and perfectly sound, if the Vice President were not here, if to allow the term of President Quezon to expire would really interrupt the constitutional processes. But when the Vice President, who normally would succeed to the Presidency if the government were in the Philippines, is right here in Washington, how can we say it upsets constitutional processes or normal functions of government?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I think perhaps the best answer to that question would be this: Those officers, being here, know the Filipino state of mind and the conditions there better than we. It is their considered judgment, I understand, that it would least disturb the processes there. Of course, it is a matter that has to be determined with reference to the effect it will have in that country. Those Filipinos, after carefully considering it, have reached the conclusion that it would have the best effect, and I think we should defer somewhat to their judgment rather than ours in determining that question.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman thinks that to continue the present President in office against their own constitution would have a better effect upon them than continuing their constitutional processes and allowing the Vice President to become President, as he was elected to do?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The way I would interpret it—and I do not know whether or not I am right—is that any change in the head of the Government of the Filipinos now might disturb and disrupt the existing status of government over there. In view of the conditions, they think it is best to make no change, regardless of whether or not, under the Constitution, it should be done, but to keep the same President as head pending this crisis.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman of our committee.

Mr. BELL. May I read this paragraph of the letter which was sent us by the Filipino officials here, answering the question the gentleman has raised?

If we were in the Philippines and our constitutional government there were functioning regularly, there would be no problem. But we are not in the Philippines, we are in the midst of a global war, and our constitutional system and democratic institutions are seriously jeopardized. The operation of the legislative and judicial branches are suspended by enemy occupation and only the executive branch which remains free from the enemy's action and is now temporarily established in Washington, is able to continue performing its functions.

Mr. JUDD. But are we not jeopardizing here today their constitutional system and democratic institutions in a more deadly way than the Japanese can? The Japanese are their enemies, and are expected to do that. We are their friends,

they do not expect us to set aside their constitution, as by a wave of the hand. That is the thing I am concerned about.

Mr. BELL. The resolution we are seeking to pass will be effective in any event only as long as the sovereignty of the United States continues, which, of course, will not be beyond 1946. According to the terms of the resolution itself, everything is thrown back into the regular constitutional channels when the President of the United States issues a proclamation declaring that constitutional processes have been reestablished in the Philippines, so that by no possible chance could it be construed as any permanent interference with constitutional government in the Philippines by the United States. I think if that were not the situation all of the Philippine officials would not be unanimously joining in a request that we take this action.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Insofar as the constitutional question is concerned, it would appear to me that the Philippine Constitution was enacted pursuant to an act of Congress, consequently there is no subversion of the Constitution as there would be if you would enter into a sovereign state and upset their constitution, or if we would attempt to do the same thing here.

As to the question of what is the best interest of the Philippines it is significant to me that the Vice President, who would assume office by succession under normal constitutional processes, himself feels that it would be to the best interest of the Philippine Islands for the incumbent to remain in office. To my mind that would answer almost any question if we consider, as we have a right to, that he is speaking as a free agent, and is animated only by a concern for the best interests of his country.

Mr. JUDD. I have the utmost respect for Vice President Osmeña. He is greatly beloved and trusted by the Filipinos. But I find nothing in the letter to indicate he believes this action should be taken. It suggests the President and Congress should review the whole situation and do whichever seems best of three possibilities—allow the Vice President to succeed to the Presidency, continue the status quo, or some other course of action.

Mr. POAGE. From a technical standpoint, the Philippine Constitution until 1946 is a charter from the United States Congress, which can be amended or changed until the day of Philippine independence by this Congress. I would heartily agree with the gentleman that with the constitution in effect, and if Philippine independence had been effective before this date, obviously this Congress could not change the Constitution any more than it could change the Constitution of Mexico or Cuba. Nor can we change the Constitution of the Philippine Republic after the date of independence, but it seems to me that obviously we can change the constitution prior to that

date, and up until that date, and whatever we have set up as rules of procedure can be changed, until that time, by this Congress. So it seems to me there is no constitutional question involved, no question of the right of this Congress, if it seems that it is in the interest of the Philippines.

The only people in the Philippines who may speak, and whose voice we can hear today, except over the Japanese radio, are the people who are here, the Commissioner of the Philippines, our colleague, who sits here, who tells us that he considers this to be beneficial to the Philippines. Then there is the President of the Philippines, who is here in Washington, and he tells us that he considers it beneficial, as does the Vice President of the Philippines who also says that he considers it to be beneficial to the people of the Philippines. They are the voice of the free people of the Philippine Islands, and they are the only voice that we have today. Being the only voice, it seems to me clear when they all testify to that effect, that we have the power to do this if it is for the good of their country, and if we have the power to do it, as to which at first I had some question, but after talking to the Commissioner I am convinced that we have the power to do it prior to 1946, and if we have, then we ought to proceed.

Mr. JUDD. I think there is no question but that we have the power. My hesitancy is not over that. It is over the wisdom of such an act. If we are doing this primarily because of the psychological effect on the people out there, then which course of action is likely to have the better effect? It is my fear that this course may do greater harm than good. I am of course greatly influenced by the testimony that has been presented here by the officials. I think we ought to have had the opportunity to ask their individual views on many aspects of the matter. On the other hand, there is quite a section of Filipino opinion in this country which is definitely opposed to this action, and has been warning us for weeks that some such bill would probably be pulled out of the hat at the last moment and rushed through Congress, just as is being attempted here today.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman says there is a section of Philippine opinion in this country that is opposed to this. I am not prepared to say that I know the attitude of the Filipinos here in regard to that, and the only criticism that I have heard has not been from the citizens of the Philippines, but from columnists who may have been in the Philippines it is true, but have no Philippine citizenship, and who are actually Americans, and have no better way of knowing than the gentleman and I have what the attitude of the Philippine people is, and I do believe that if the gentleman and I think we represent our people, then the Commissioner probably knows what the wishes of the people of the Philippine Islands are. It seems to me that if we are going to insist that we know the opinions of our people, we must accept him as being the best voice for the people of the Philippines now.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not a fact that overriding this constitution would have the effect of keeping in office an official who would go out of office in a few days, and who is ill and will be unable to attend to his duties? This will keep him in office as against a man who received 2 percent more votes than he did in the same election. Is it not possible there is some Washington and Philippine politics in this thing?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman can draw his own conclusions as to that.

Mr. CURTIS. What happens if we do not pass this resolution?

Mr. JUDD. That is the question that I raised.

Mr. CURTIS. Who would take office?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Osmena.

Mr. CURTIS. What encouragement can we send to the enslaved people of the world if the Congress of the United States abrogates constitutions to keep people in power and thus creates perpetuity in office when there is no necessity for it?

Mr. JUDD. That was my original question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that with the issue of the constitutional questions which arise in this particular matter, at least a majority of the House should know that this particular thing is coming up? Does not the gentleman feel that perhaps we should let this matter go over for the day and permit the body of the House to thoroughly consider it?

Mr. JUDD. I most certainly do.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota, has not yielded the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman has yielded the floor. Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the right to object.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] who is in charge of the bill, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in view of the discussion that has arisen and the demand for more information, if we might not adopt this procedure: the gentleman from Massachusetts, might ask unanimous consent that this bill be taken up tomorrow with 1 hour of general debate, and then consider it under the general rules of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is an excellent idea.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. With that I am in full agreement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a very fine suggestion.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] withdraw his unanimous consent?

Mr. BELL. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider this bill tomorrow under the regular rules of the House, with 1 hour general debate, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs and the ranking minority member.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman make that request with reference to Senate Joint Resolution 95.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow Senate Joint Resolution 95, which I understand is the same as the resolution reported by the House committee may be considered under the general rules of the House, with 1 hour of general debate, one-half of the time to be controlled by the chairman of the committee and one-half the time by the ranking minority member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request from the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the time allotted for general debate is only 1 hour?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would ask that the gentleman make that 2 hours.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule, and there will be plenty of time to discuss the matter.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As long as I am assured of a little time on the particular bill, I express my appreciation to the leaders for accepting my suggestion that this be placed over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ARMED SERVICES HONOR DAY

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 177) requesting the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day and urging that it be properly observed throughout the Nation.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the 7th day of December 1943 be, and it is hereby, designated as Armed Services Honor Day and that the President of the United States is hereby requested to issue a proclamation commending the observance of that day in honor of all men and women who have served or are now serving in any and all branches of the military and naval armed services of the United States of America, and in prayer expressing our gratitude to Almighty God for His blessings thus far and imploring His continued favor, protecting care, and aid in their

behalf and of the United Nations, the complete victory of their arms, the restoration to health and strength of the wounded and ill, and a righteous, lasting peace.

That the Governor of every State is hereby requested to invoke the cordial cooperation of the people of the State he serves and that the counties and municipalities are hereby urged to make plans and hold appropriate ceremonies for proper observance of the occasion in every community.

That the proper authorities are hereby requested to authorize such component parts of the military or naval forces to participate in ceremonies attending the observance of Armed Services Honor Day, in such manner and to such extent as, in their discretion, may be consistent with the exigencies of the moment.

That fitting messages be transmitted through approved channels to all those in whose honor the day is dedicated.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, in line 11, strike out the remainder of the resolution.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 59 may be considered in lieu of House Joint Resolution 177.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Sunday, the 1st day of August 1943, be, and hereby is, designated as Armed Services Honor Day and that the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation setting aside that day as a public occasion for the recognition and the honoring of all men and women who have served or now are serving in any and all branches of the military and naval armed services of the United States of America.

That the civil, religious, educational, and patriotic authorities of States, counties, cities, and towns be, and they are hereby, urged to make plans for the proper observance of this day and that they arrange and hold appropriate ceremonies in their respective communities in honor of all members of the United States of America armed forces and particularly the national defenders from the States and localities in which they reside.

That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy be, and hereby are, authorized to recommend participation by military and naval forces under their respective jurisdiction in ceremonies marking the occasion of Armed Services Honor Day, in such manner and to such extent that is consistent with the exigencies of the moment.

That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to prepare and transmit a message to all of our armed forces everywhere, and especially to those heroes who have come from the scenes of battle to recover from their wounds or illnesses, expressing the Commander in Chief's and the Nation's gratitude and voicing our prayers for a final and complete victory and their safe return to the pursuits of civil life in a world at peace.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of Senate Joint Resolution 59, and substitute therefor the language of House Joint Resolution 177, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the resolution (H. J. Res. 177) was passed be vacated and House Joint Resolution 177 be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

ARE DETROIT INDUSTRIES PAYING TOO MUCH FOR NATURAL GAS?—THE NATION'S TAXPAYERS FOOT THE BILL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, an important part of our job is to speed the day of complete and lasting peace at a prudent expenditure of lives and money. If a few days' caution can save a thousand casualties along the road to Rome, our people demand no less. In like degree they are insisting that war's terrible waste in property, as well as human values, shall be held to the minimum. For that reason I renew my recent protest against the needless burden, amounting to many thousands of dollars, placed on all taxpayers by the excessive natural-gas rates charged to war plants at Detroit, and I restate my opinion that an inquiry by this House is warranted.

Detroit is the core of the Nation's production, and fuel is the blood sustaining that effort. Natural gas has come into wide use at Detroit, Mr. Speaker, but why must its war plants pay a rate which is among the highest in the United States? This question is prompted by some additional data furnished at my request by the Federal Power Commission.

In an address to the House last September 27, I quoted a Commission report revealing an industrial rate of 61 cents per thousand cubic feet at Detroit, as compared to a 46-cent rate at Cleveland and a rate of only 40 cents at Pittsburgh. I have since been informed that my facts were inadequate because I omitted to point out that the natural gas used in Pittsburgh and Cleveland contains more heat units and that, despite lower gas costs at Cleveland war plants, the gas company at Cleveland has paid a higher rate for its supply than is paid by the gas company at Detroit. Such omissions, however, are partly remedied in the tabulation below, where the rates are expressed according to therms, rather than cubic feet. Average rates for small consumers are also added, and the list of cities has expanded from three to nine.

Rates at Pittsburgh are significant because several gas companies distribute gas there. Cleveland expects to obtain some of its natural gas from the same

pipe line supplying Detroit, to which Fort Wayne, Muncie, and Lafayette are also connected. Toledo and Windsor are Detroit's friendly neighborhood rivals. Chicago derives its natural gas from the same general southwestern area supplying Detroit.

I am reliably informed that Detroit is the largest American city using full-strength natural gas, unmixed with the inferior manufactured gas. Aside from the mammoth war industries and increasing population, about 50,000 homes in the Detroit area use natural gas for winter heating. Thus an unparalleled business opportunity exists, so that moderate gas rates to war industries might reasonably be anticipated. The tabulation presented here, however, demonstrates that in every classification without exception Detroit industrial rates are highest. They exceed by 50 percent not only the Pittsburgh prices, but likewise the rates at Muncie, where the gas is drawn from the pipe line to Detroit.

Competition, and not more regulation, is the American solution to exorbitant prices. Some years ago a number of Detroit's principal industries sought to break the gas price bottleneck by bargaining for an independent natural-gas supply, but were unsuccessful. It is my opinion that any inquiry by the Military Affairs Committee, which has investigated other phases of wartime gas supplies, should determine whether Detroit's war plants are even now barred from competitive purchasing of natural-gas requirements.

I now want to give to the House some comparative rates on the subject of natural gas: In Detroit 50,000 therms cost, per therm, 6.57 cents; in Chicago, 5.35 cents; in Cleveland, 4.39 cents; in Fort Wayne, 6.50 cents; in Lafayette, 5.29 cents; in Muncie, 4.28 cents; in Toledo, 4.77 cents; in Windsor, 4.79 cents; and in Pittsburgh, Pa., 3.78 cents. I could go on and give a number of other figures, but instead, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks reports from the Federal Power Commission as of October 1, and a letter from the same source dated October 28.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, October 28, 1943.

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Complying with your request of October 22, there is submitted below a schedule of average natural gas rates available to large industrial firm gas consumers in the city of Pittsburgh and vicinity. The rates shown are net rates and are comparable with those furnished you under date of October 1 for Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, Windsor, and certain Indiana cities.

There are three companies generally furnishing natural gas for Pittsburgh industries. The rates of each are given since those for one differ somewhat from the other two which are alike.

There are additional published schedules for interruptible service which show, for

large monthly consumption, rates somewhat lower than those here listed.

Consumption, therms per month	Average rate in cents per therm—Pittsburgh	
	Equitable Gas Co.	Peoples Natural Gas Co. and Manufacturer's Light & Heat Co.
50,000.....	3.78	3.48
100,000.....	3.77	3.48
150,000.....	3.77	3.48
200,000.....	3.77	3.48
300,000.....	3.77	3.48
500,000.....	3.77	3.48
700,000.....	3.77	3.48

If the Commission can be of further service kindly advise.

Sincerely,

BASIL MANLY,
Acting Chairman.

Comparison of rates for large industrial firm gas consumers for Detroit and adjacent areas

Consumption, therms per month	Average net rate in cents per therm						
	Detroit	Chicago	Cleveland	Fort Wayne	Lafayette	Muncie	Toledo Windsor
50,000.....	6.57	5.35	4.39	6.50	5.29	4.28	4.77 4.79
100,000.....	6.03	5.18	4.21	5.50	5.12	4.06	4.77 4.78
150,000.....	5.68	4.85	4.05	5.17	4.84	3.82	4.77 4.78
200,000.....	5.49	4.84	3.84	5.00	4.86	3.50	4.76 4.78
300,000.....	5.29	4.73	3.84	4.83	4.52	3.13	4.76 4.78
500,000.....	5.14	4.64	3.76	4.70	4.39	2.83	4.76 4.78
700,000.....	5.07	4.60	3.73	4.64	4.34	2.71	4.76 4.78

Information furnished by Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C., Oct. 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FOOD SUBSIDIES—TO BE OR NOT TO BE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of discussing with the Members of the House this important matter of subsidies. There is a great difference of opinion among those familiar with the subject as to what is going to be accomplished by the use of subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1943, the President of the United States laid before the Congress a message dealing with the subject of food production and inflation. In the opening paragraph of that message he said, and I quote:

Food is as important as any other weapon in the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, for many months Members of this House have called attention to that fact, so it is with some assurance that we now observe that the Chief Executive agrees with that point of view. It is to be hoped that copies of that message have been placed on the desks of the men in all Government agencies who are charged with the responsibility of organizing a productive food program. There is no evidence that such is the case to date.

The President admits that 90 percent of the cost of living has been stabilized

and that the other 10 percent is out of hand. The answer to that problem, according to his message, is further subsidies to the farmer. Accepting his statement for face value one is prompted to inquire about the possibility of uncontrolled inflation with only 10 percent of living costs involved? What the President actually suggests is that the Federal Treasury pay out another \$800,000,000 or more to the farmers. This suggestion is made, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the farmer is in a fairly prosperous position. The farmer is not asking for this Federal hand-out; all he asks is a fair price in the market place and upon such assurance he will produce all the food necessary to supply our armed services and the civilian population. As a matter of fact, if the Government had kept its promise to the American farmer and permitted prices to rise to parity we would not be confronted with this problem. All that is needed is a fulfilling of promises, nothing else.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Upon the point of subsidies, does the gentleman know of any farm-group organizations that are asking for subsidies of the Congress at this time?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There is only one group I know of, and that is the so-called Farmers' Union group which represents a very small minority, however, so far as farmers are concerned.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman should not include all farmers' unions, because the Farmers' Union of the State of Nebraska does not favor subsidies and never has.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am glad to have that observation because the Farmers' Union group, I understood, are definitely on record in favor of subsidies, and I believe the national leader, Mr. Patton, has been quoted as being in favor of subsidies.

It cannot be successfully denied that subsidies to the farmer will be at the expense of the taxpayer. The New Deal has been busy spinning some fancy theory around the subsidy idea, by arguing that it is a benefit to the consumer and especially to certain so-called white-collar groups. But are not these people taxpayers as well as consumers? Even the farmers who receive the subsidies are consumers and taxpayers. I submit, that in the long run, it will be cheaper to pay an increased price for this group of 10 percent commodities than the President states is now out of hand than to pay out money for subsidies. The danger of uncontrolled inflation from this source is very much greater than from the other. Farm prices can be fixed as well as other commodities but it must be done on a realistic basis and in accordance with the parity formula.

Some one has said that "subsidies and withholding taxes are Gold Dust Twins." Withholding taxes simply take a part of

the wage out of the pay envelope. Actually it results in less money to the worker. Now if we follow this money that has been withheld we see it travel on to Washington where a substantial part of it is used to pay the salaries of those who are used to collect the money and administer the law. Part of it is left to pay subsidies that are intended to reduce the cost of living. What is the result—and every workingman in the United States should understand this—to the worker? He has paid in taxes a great deal more than he has gained in reduced living costs. The payment of taxpayers' money to support the governmental program is always the grounds to request more and more taxes. The worker, be he on the farm or in the factory, is the only one who can lose under this system. The payment of subsidies to the farmer does not help the farmer. He can only be helped, as I have already indicated, by a fair price in the market place. That is all he asks.

Mr. Speaker, this fight against the payment of subsidies to the farmers is not a partisan one. Listen to what the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee had to say about this program on last June 25. I quote him:

Everybody understands that the way to get production is to pay fair prices. Laborers on the farms have been attracted to higher wages everywhere, paralyzing the production of necessary food and other products. Everybody understands that—

Says the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]. Continuing, he said:

Certainly no man can make any serious pretense of opposing inflation if he proposes to have the Government borrow money and incur an increase in the bonded debt of the Nation in order to pay the grocery bills for people whose salaries and wages are at levels never before known in the history of our Nation.

It is necessary to keep in mind the distinction between subsidies that are intended to promote the production of food so necessary to the war effort and the subsidies that are intended to roll back prices and thereby pay part of the grocery bill. This is an entirely new philosophy of subsidies, and only a New Deal bureaucrat could figure out that one.

As I have already intimated above, the American people are in a better position today to pay its grocery bill than at any time in our history. Excessive purchasing power leads to inflation, and by the very art of rolling back prices the consumer has more money to spend for other commodities. The only way we can raise the money to pay for subsidies is by taxation or bonding.

The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has put the matter very succinctly when he said:

Is there an individual in the United States today who wants his boy and his girl, whether in the Army or not, to pay this month's grocery bill for him? When you subsidize the grocery bill of the Nation, you are passing on to posterity the bill that you should pay out of the largest income in the history of our Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has made a most significant statement from the standpoint of the fact that it is unjust to pass on to the taxpayers who are now in uniform the cost of today's grocery bills. All Members of the House may not know it, but I know that the gentleman speaks with some knowledge of the mind of the veteran because he has been very active in American Legion circles and his wife at the present time is president of the National Women's Auxiliary of the American Legion; so it is not exactly conjecture on his part.

I hate to interrupt the gentleman's presentation because he is making a very splendid speech as is his custom. Yesterday one of the gentleman's colleagues from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG], in colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEFFEL], stated that in the dairy business there was no material increase in production—I believe those were the words that were used—up in Canada from the standpoint of the subsidy program. Our main concern now, therefore, is, Will the subsidy program work to hold down inflation? Or will it stimulate inflation? I was interested in the gentleman's discussion to the effect that it would tend to stimulate inflation, because I agree that anything which increases the ratio of money to consumer goods tends to bring about inflation; it is inflationary per se.

I think it should also be pointed out that the argument formerly used by the President that subsidies were necessary in conjunction with the hold-the-line order is now antiquated, because the hold-the-line order has been violated. It was violated when the President and his advisers capitulated to John L. Lewis on the coal strike. They yielded to the price increase which Lewis demanded. The line has been broken and there does not seem to be much rhyme or reason in Congress' attempting to hold a broken line by giving subsidies which in turn would bring about inflation. So I congratulate the gentleman on his splendid talk and I hope the Members of Congress will take time to study it and read it very carefully.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

The President, of course, has approved the payment of subsidies, but you will note in his message to us that he refers to subsidies as "equalization payments" and "food-production aids." The public has not been fooled, for by this time, I believe, it understands the real import of subsidies and it prefers to pay the grocery bill for today's food now.

In connection with that "hold the line" order I wish to read a very important part of the President's message. I believe it bears repeating on this "hold the line" proposition. He stated under the subject of consumer food prices:

The "hold the line" order was designed to undo the damage that had been done, and to prevent any further damage. The rise in

the cost of living having resulted almost entirely from the increase in certain food prices, the program was quite properly designed to bring those food prices back to their September levels as far as possible.

Then he goes on to explain how the Government has been handling this question of squeezing so-called profits out of prices.

He continues:

The reductions in cabbage and lettuce resulted from squeezing the water out of the price structure by reducing excessive margins of distributors wherever they were found to exist. The retail prices of meat and butter were reduced by 10 percent. In these instances the prices received by farmers and distributors did not permit reductions without bringing returns to unreasonably low levels.

And that, Mr. Speaker, refers to the prices that the farmers get.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman well knows that this so-called subsidy is being laid at the door of the farmers by certain parties who speak in this House who, in my opinion, do not know whereof they speak, these particular parties claiming that the subsidy is to aid the farmer in production, yet I know that on my own dairy farm upon which I keep records I received the very same price per pound for butter last March as I did last September. Consequently what the gentleman from Wisconsin is saying today upholds me entirely and I believe it to be the viewpoint of the farmers of the Nation that this certainly should be known as a subsidy to consumers and, if anything, acts as a ceiling on the farmer's commodities.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think that is absolutely right.

The President continues:

Accordingly equalization payments—

You will notice he no longer calls it subsidy—

equalization payments are paid by the Government to the processor to enable him to reduce the prices of these products without loss to himself and without reducing the price to be paid the farmer. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation undertook to make these payments to processors of meat and butter so that the retail cost of these foods might be held down while the producers received a large enough return to encourage output. The Public Treasury has been using as food-production aids other forms of payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and so-called section 32 operation for support prices. Additional or subsidy payments have been made to industry in order to secure wartime production of many essentials, including copper, zinc, aluminum, and other critical materials.

But I want to call your attention to the fact that the subsidy paid to the man to produce is one thing and a subsidy paid to a group so that the price may be rolled back is an entirely different matter and, as I said in the formal part of my address, this is a new philosophy.

Mr. JONKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. Does not the gentleman feel that the use of this term "equalization" is to avoid the term of subsidizing the consumer?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. There is no doubt about that in my mind.

We have paid premiums to speed up construction of ships and other war materials—

And I say to the President properly so. Let us pay the subsidies that we have to in order to stimulate production, but there is nothing in the President's speech that I have been able to observe to justify the payment of the kind of subsidy he is now asking for.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to express my appreciation for the thought the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin has put upon this subject. I would like to ask a question. In his contacts with his farmers individually and the farm groups in his district, may I ask the gentleman if he does not feel that they are of the opinion that the thought of subsidy is a further attempt at regimentation of the farmer himself?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I can say to the gentleman very frankly that the farmer today resents the fact that Uncle Sam has agents out in the field who from time to time come along and offer him a Government check. This very morning I received a two-page letter from a farm group in my State protesting against this very practice. The American farmer, in my opinion, is what you might really call a rugged individualist, and he wants none of this Government interference. He says, "Give me a price and I will produce."

In consequence of these programs the rise in the cost of living which has proceeded without interruption from the early months of 1942 was brought to an abrupt halt. In June 1943 the cost of living fell to 5.9 percent above the September 1942 level, in July to 5.2 percent, and in August to 4.8 percent. It is true that in September 1943 the cost of living rose by nearly one-half percent. It was not due to food but mainly to the cost of clothing.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. Is it not a fact that some of the new dealers have been using the argument that subsidies have held down the cost of living when, really, what has held down the cost of living has been the ceiling prices on these various goods? That has done the job of holding down the cost of living.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think that is right.

Mr. LANDIS. Is it not a fact that if subsidies prevail it will lead to three things—namely, more bureaucrats, more taxes, and more power in Washington? May I say, in reference to power in Washington, it is a fact that there is an old axiom that the man who pays the

piper calls the tune. Certainly under this program Washington would be able to dictate even what we eat, since Washington is paying for it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for that observation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is true, of course, as the gentleman well knows, that ceiling prices keep the cost of living down, but where you have support prices for the same commodities which are higher than the ceiling prices, when you want to lower the support price or raise the ceiling price, you almost have to meet it with a subsidy. Can the gentleman conceive of any other manner in which you can maintain a support price and at the same time a ceiling price without a subsidy?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman think the answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the fact it is only being done on a very minor number of food products at the present time? It has never been indulged in in connection with any major food products.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes; and how many such items are actually in that category?

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman mean items in which the support price is higher than the ceiling price?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. You are including in that the cost of transportation and the cost of processing?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have such a list, and I will be glad to give it, but I do not have it at hand at the moment. I will be glad to get it. I am sure I have it. We had some statistics in the committee, and I think that was one of them.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. When I started out I stated that there was an honest difference of opinion. There are two schools of thought on this subject, but I cannot see how we are going to get much help from subsidies in this situation, especially when we have the President admitting that we are only concerned with about 10 percent of the commodities that are involved in any spiral of inflation. I doubt that there is any real danger from uncontrolled inflation, even if we accept the President's own premise.

I want to conclude with this final paragraph, to indicate just where we are going or what is contemplated by the sponsors of the subsidy program. There is now being put into effect a program recently announced to reduce the retail prices to consumers of other items—apples, onions, potatoes, sweet potatoes, peanut butter, lard, and vegetable shortening. I am prompted to ask this question: Where are we going to stop? We will be subsidizing every commodity in the country.

Next week this House is going to be confronted with and will have to pass on one of the most important bills that has come before us in a long time. I refer to the Steagall bill. I believe it goes without saying that we are going to be confronted with an issue that will have a great effect on how we are going to spend the taxpayers' dollars and just what we are going to do about helping the farmer, who needs help today. The farmers in my district, as I have already stated, do not want the Government to interfere; they want good prices, fair prices in the market place.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I happen to have this list here. I thought perhaps the gentleman would like to use it in his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Fine.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks tables prepared by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. It is true that the farm organizations, the dairy associations, the food processors, and the food distributors are against the subsidy program. By their practical experience they ought to know something about subsidies.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes. I think there is a misconception about subsidies. We have this question of subsidies to get production. That is one thing. As far as the war effort is concerned, I think we are agreed that if we must have production the Government will pay something, it will pay a premium, for it; but never before have subsidies been used to roll back prices.

Mr. LANDIS. The dairy associations tell us, and have told us for months, that if an increase of 1 cent a quart of milk were granted it would solve the milk problem. Those in the canning industry have said for a year or more, "If they will give us 1 cent a can we will increase the production." What has happened in the canning industry in the last few months? They have decreased production over 30 percent. They have lost production on account of giving subsidies.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I think that is right. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are willing to pay their own grocery bill. Our people who are paying the 20-percent withholding tax are beginning to realize that when the

bureaucrats spend, we pay. There is some loose talk that subsidies are holding down the cost of living but the fact is that price ceilings prevent the increase in prices. The subsidy program is a complete admission on the part of the O. P. A. that it is unable to control prices and must resort to hidden inflation rather than orderly wartime price adjustments. The roll-back of food prices will not effectively stimulate food production. On the contrary, it will have the opposite effect. These so-called roll-backs will roll back the taxpayer by collecting \$2 in the form of the withholding tax and give him back \$1 in reduced prices. Farm organizations, dairy associations, food producers, and processors are opposed to subsidies.

Subsidies are unfair because they are paid from borrowings at the expense of our fighting forces and future generations. Subsidies lead to inflation because they increase available purchasing power, increase Federal expenditures, and contribute to a loss of confidence in the financial stability of the Government. Subsidies are economically unsound and vicious. They lead to regimentation and political control.

Briefly, the so-called roll-back program means three things to every citizen:

First. More bureaucrats.

Second. More power in Washington, for it is an axiom that the man who pays the piper calls the tune, and certainly under this program Washington would be able to dictate to us even what we eat, since Washington is paying for it.

Third. More taxes. The administration has been strangely silent on the fact that to pay these subsidies it must sell more War bonds, collect more taxes, or borrow more money from the banks. This means, of course, that the consumer will have to pay more taxes if the roll-back program is carried out.

ALLOWANCE TO WIDOW OF OFFICER OR ENLISTED MAN

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2188) to amend the act providing for the payment of allowance on death of officer or enlisted man to widow, or person designated, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to address the House today. Due to the lateness of the hour, I desire to relinquish that time, and ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

EXAMINING STAFF FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when I received unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes to-

day, I did not realize so many other Members of the House had similar requests to submit. Because of the fact there are a number of Members who wish to speak following me today, I shall not take the full 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to talk about a matter that is most urgent, a matter about which I am very serious, so serious that I feel my colleagues should have the benefit of what I have to say, and also that I might have the benefit of any argument that might be advanced against the position that I take. As many Members know, on October 19 I introduced a resolution which provides for an examining staff for each subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with the exception of the Judiciary and the Legislative Subcommittees. In the year 1921 the Budget Bureau and General Accounting Office were organized by law. The Budget Director is purely and simply an agent of the President. The Comptroller General, who has the General Accounting Office under him, is the agent of the Congress, but I think it is fair to say the Congress does not have the necessary contact, does not have the supervision over the expenditure of funds that we should have, because of the fact that we have no contact, no examining staff, no auditors, no supervision whatever over the funds which we appropriate once a year. The spending agencies go ahead and spend that money, with no supervision from the Congress, and when they run out of money, they come to the Congress again and ask for a deficiency appropriation and generally get what they want. However, I am happy to say, and I am sure the American taxpayer was pleased and now has more faith and confidence in their Congress since last week, when the Deficiency Subcommittee reduced the requests of the Budget Bureau on a bill by around 82 percent. Thereby the public must have learned something about the Budget Bureau, they must have decided that the Budget Bureau had not been operating effectively, for certainly if the Budget Bureau had been operating effectively they would not have O. K.'d some of the items in that bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is on the Appropriations Committee and has made a profound examination of the matter of expenditures. I wonder if he can inform the House whether I am correct in my conclusion, that the Budget Bureau, as it presently functions, is more an agency to report back to the Congress just which expenditures meet with the approval of the President, than it is to inform the Congress of those expenditures which the country can afford.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the history of the Budget Bureau speaks for itself. It seems that when the President asks for an appropriation it goes through the Budget Bureau with no questions asked.

Mr. MUNDT. My observation has been that what purports to be a Budget Bureau has become simply a propaganda agency for emphasizing on House committees that the President wants this or

that expenditure, without any regard as to the Nation's capacity to pay.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman, and to offset that we established the General Accounting Office, which was supposed to pass on the legality of each appropriation, to determine whether it is according to law, not whether the price paid for something is too much or too little. Therefore, we have no agency whatever to determine whether we are paying too much or whether we are paying too little. As far as paying too little is concerned, I do not think that very apt to happen under the present system.

Mr. MUNDT. At the moment, about the only recourse we have in Congress is to support the strong right arm and good, clear conscience of Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, and if we can stop these New Deal spending artists from disqualifying him, there is some small chance that a modicum of economy may result.

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly right, and I am sure that Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, would welcome an agent from each subcommittee to work with him, to go over these appropriations with him, and report back to the different subcommittees. We would then have something of a businesslike program, a businesslike method in the Congress, such as we find in all private business.

Mr. MUNDT. And the gentleman's bill does that very thing; does it not?

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. MUNDT. The country owes the gentleman a debt of gratitude for making possible this reform, without which there looks to be small opportunity to preserve the solvency of this Republic.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Spencer, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. It might be pointed out that the very wording of the departmental reports when they come back to the subcommittees is that the proposed legislation, to use the language that the Budget Bureau uses does or does not fit into the President's program, and the Bureau of the Budget is the voice of the President as to whether or not he wants a certain appropriation. The gentleman is going into something that affects every pay envelope in America, and it is rather interesting to know that the Republican attendance today is about 10-to-1 of the majority party.

Mr. JENSEN. And I am sure that we will save money for every taxpayer if this resolution is adopted.

I am sure it will tend to reduce expenditures of the Government by millions, and possibly billions.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, the gentleman's main purpose is to save money to the taxpayers?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. Every dollar that is not needed for the waging of war. Of course, first of all we want to win the war, and we do not want to take away a dime needed for winning the war.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations covering military matters has recommended to this Congress the expenditure of many billions of dollars in the last year or so.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So that if you wanted experts to examine into the sufficiency of the requests you would need quite a number of experts, would you not, to investigate the operations of the Army, and to really make intelligent recommendations to Congress, and you would add to the present set-up of the Federal Government, a great many experts, perhaps what are sometimes called "long-haired experts and economists," of whom we have heard too much, which would do the American people very little good? The same is true of the Navy Department Appropriation Committee. If you attempted to hire experts to investigate all of those activities, you would certainly add a great many employees to the Federal Government.

Mr. JENSEN. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think that this Congress should have a closer relationship and have a closer scrutiny over the spending of the billions of dollars that we have appropriated, sometimes almost blindly, than we have at this time? I am asking for a yes or no.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, it could not do any harm to have a closer scrutiny, but there are some reasons that can be advanced in opposition to the gentleman's proposal, and it is not quite as simple as it sounds. If you want to hire additional experts—in my opinion, one of the things the matter with the Federal Government now is that they have too many experts and too many economists.

Mr. JENSEN. Downtown, but not enough up here.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You just want to add more experts and more economists. I think we should consider that angle a little, too.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. Now, I want to say this: The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is not a member of the Committee on Appropriations but if he were and had sat in subcommittee hearings for weeks upon weeks upon weeks, where hundreds of gentlemen from departments of Government, agencies, and bureaus came and asked for these huge sums of the taxpayers' money, and he could not ask intelligent questions about just how this money was being spent, what was going on down here, and who was spending what, and how much, I would like to know how the gentleman would feel if he were in the position that I and the other members on the Appropriations Committee are in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield to permit an observation?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, this Government is set up on the basis of the executive, judicial, and the legislative branches. When representatives of the executive departments come before committees of Congress, of course, we are assuming or supposed to assume that we have confidence in them, and that they

have the best interests of the Government, and of the people at heart, just the same as the legislative branch has. But, if we have no confidence in them, then, of course, it will be necessary to set up another superagency in whom we can place confidence as Members of Congress. Now, you set up a vast bureau of experts of Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. It would not take a vast bureau.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, the gentleman said it takes weeks and weeks and there are hundreds of items coming before them. You would want the experts of the Congress to be familiar with each and every one of the items that came before you for consideration. So, from a practical standpoint I think we should consider whether or not it is not better to have in the bureaus and departments persons upon whom we can rely and in whom we have confidence.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish we had. I only wish we had.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is only a question of whether we do have those people in the departments upon whom we should rely. But I rather hesitate to add additional experts and bureaus, pile one upon another, and keep on that process endlessly.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not think I have to stand here, or you or anybody else, and defend before the eyes of the American people, these many public officials in our Government who have a record of reckless spending. Anything you say or I say will not make those folks any more pure than they are. What I am doing is this: I am not proposing to set up here an auditing staff. I am proposing to set up an examining staff, and there is a world of difference. That staff, which will be, to start with as I would recommend it, only one expert examiner for each subcommittee; and an expert examiner who is skilled in the art has a faculty of smelling bad things and following the scent and report to the subcommittee every 30 days or at such other time as the subcommittee shall direct, and by so doing, is it not natural to believe that any agency or any official of government will be in the same category as a man running a branch bank or a branch office for some big company, where they send out examiners each month to bring back a report to the head office, and by so doing, carry on a sensible businesslike management?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield for a short observation?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. The reason I am yielding to you so much is because I want to know if there is anything wrong with this program that I have outlined.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will agree that perhaps the Federal Government is so vast that it is extremely difficult for the Congress to have its fingers on the expenses in every little detail or every little bureau or section.

Mr. JENSEN. It is a very big business, I will admit.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It might be well to have some additional help from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JENSEN. You will be endorsing my resolution if you keep on talking.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, I might endorse it right now, but I just wanted to say that you have to be careful that you do not add a vast number of experts and economists to the public pay roll. We have heard a great deal of complaint from the American people about the vastness of the civilian employees that we have.

Mr. JENSEN. I am only going to ask the Committee on Accounts for \$75,000 for the balance of this Congress.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I did not know the gentleman was going to discuss this subject. Why does not the gentleman tell the House that the Appropriations Committee received \$100,000 for investigations and has about \$75,000 left.

Mr. JENSEN. Now the gentleman knows as well as every other Member of Congress that the \$100,000 which was appropriated last year for an examining staff or an investigating staff for the Appropriations Committee, was simply permissive in character.

My resolution is mandatory. The gentleman knows that nothing of any consequence has been done and that we are still groping in the dark.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know what the Appropriations Committee is doing, but the gentleman is a member of it; he ought to know.

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely; and that is just why I am presenting this resolution. I do know, and it is worrying me, and it should be worrying the gentleman in whom I have so much confidence and faith because he was my chairman of the Committee on Accounts for 2 years and I have much confidence in him. I know that he always tries to save money. I cannot understand why he is opposed to this measure.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have not expressed myself on the measure yet. I told the gentleman the other day, and I told a member of the committee today that he spoke to—the gentleman has been polling or contacting members of the committee by letter.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, just a minute.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I have not polled the committee. Last night I sent each member of the committee a letter asking them to give me permission to come before the committee. I have not polled the committee. Is not that proper procedure?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will ask the gentleman this: Why should he go to the members of the committee and ask them for permission to come to the committee when I have given him my promise—and I have been around here for nearly 20 years and no man in this House can say I ever made a promise I did not keep—I told the gentleman that he would get a hearing when the members of the committee were here. They are not here now. I expect them to be here when the tax bill comes up next week. I told the gentleman personally that he would have a hearing before the committee next week if the members were here, and I also told him that at the

same time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] would have a hearing on a bill that he has been introducing for the last three or four Congresses.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right; and I will say to the gentleman that I wanted to make sure that the committee members did know about this resolution, had full knowledge of it. If there is anything wrong with that, I would like to know what it is. The gentleman is not the whole committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. I realize that; but when I give the gentleman a promise why ask them? I have the right to call the committee whenever I want to. I called it this morning, a few hours ago.

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot imagine why the gentleman is so wrought up about this thing.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not wrought up. I have told the gentleman that he can get a hearing.

Mr. JENSEN. I appreciate that.

Mr. COCHRAN. I again assure the gentleman that he is to have his hearing.

Mr. JENSEN. And I let every member of the Accounts Committee know what they were entitled to know, because every one of them are members of the committee with equal authority. I realize, of course, that the chairman has more authority than the rest.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no; he does not.

Mr. JENSEN. But he has always been fair to everybody when I was on the committee. Now, if the gentleman wants to get into an argument, I could advance something else.

Mr. COCHRAN. Go ahead and advance it; I can stand it; I can always take care of myself.

Mr. JENSEN. I am not going to fight with the gentleman because I admire him too much.

Mr. COCHRAN. I promised the gentleman a hearing; he is going to get the hearing.

Mr. JENSEN. I could not get angry with the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. One of the members called me up this morning.

Mr. JENSEN. One of the members of the committee called me this morning also and said he had called the gentleman from Missouri. I think he is a very able member.

Mr. COCHRAN. He is an able member.

Mr. JENSEN. All right; now, what is wrong?

Mr. COCHRAN. Nothing.

Mr. JENSEN. All right; that's fine.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The gentleman a few moments ago made the statement that there were certain men in the Government whose philosophy was one of spending. I am wondering if the gentleman has read a book called *Economy in Our Democracy*, written by seven Harvard economists, one of whom is Dr. Gilbert, who is now Chief Economist in the O. P. A.? A footnote appeared on one of the pages of the book stating that a great deal of the material in this book

was contributed by men in Government positions but that for obvious reasons their names could not be used. This book was written in 1938. I spent yesterday afternoon reading it, and it was quite a revelation to me. Their theory was that American prosperity was directly in proportion to the size of the national debt, along with lots of other philosophies which I do not care to take the time to go into, but that was one of the things that struck me very forcibly: Their philosophy, their theory of government, was that prosperity in America, in a democracy, was in proportion to the size of the national debt.

Mr. JENSEN. I take it, then, that the gentleman is for my resolution? Did I hear him say "Yes"? He nodded his head "Yes." I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I should like to ask the gentleman from Maryland if these seven Harvard economists are still on the Government pay roll or if there are still seven left at Harvard?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I do not know. There is only one Dr. Gilbert, and he is on the pay roll as Chief Economist of the O. P. A. The thing in which I was particularly interested was the footnote which stated that a great deal of the material in this book was furnished by men in Government positions but that for obvious reasons their names could not be used. This is a philosophy of government that it would be well for the Members of Congress to read.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, yes; somebody said we should forget the dollar sign.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. We had to have a great national debt and the higher the debt the greater our prosperity.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. A moment ago it was pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] that they already had experts in the department and it was a question of confidence, that we could rely on their research and advice as to how much money we should appropriate. I think the gentleman is in error. It is not a question of confidence, it is not a question involving their honesty and integrity, it is like running a school and having the students grade their own examination papers. Those gentlemen who testified before your committee and who are acquainted with the minute details of the departments, share in the appropriation, do they not?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. They are interested in the growth of the department.

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. And they are interested in the financial rewards of their fellow workers.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Under the gentleman's proposal, the individual who would investigate and report back to you would not share in the appropriation, would

not have any stake in the department, would not draw a salary from there or would not have any personal feeling about the growth or decline of that department?

Mr. JENSEN. That is correct. I may say at this point that I do not want to give the impression that all these gentlemen who come before our Appropriations Committee asking for these appropriations are trying to get too much money and are reckless spenders. A lot of these gentlemen are mighty fine, upstanding men and they run their departments in fine shape. I took a 30-day trip this summer going over considerable of the country looking after a lot of things that pertained to the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations and 95 percent of the people in the field who are working for the Government are doing a good job in that Department at least. The inefficiency is right here in Washington in most instances.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What proportion of the yearly appropriations for strictly governmental departments, not for war or war agencies, is not reported out of the Appropriations Committee practically unanimously?

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman mean what percent of the requests that are made?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. After the bills come on the floor, we who are members of other committees, rely on the fact that the Appropriations Committee meets every day. It is practically a perpetual committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I find on voting on appropriations and in defending myself or any other Member of Congress against the term "reckless spending" that I look at the Record and find the bulk of the appropriations for the regular governmental departments receive the unanimous approval of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is exactly right because you have nothing at all on which to base any other contention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was going to say, among other things, that the motive behind the gentleman's resolution is, of course, correct. We may find something that the Appropriations Committee itself could not find and it would lead to streamlining of this very complex thing that grows up, may I say, under any party in wartime.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. A moment ago it was said that the employees of the executive branch of the Government coming before your committee are enthusiastic about their work. However, at the same time they are restricted under the policy from asking for more money than is recommended by the Budget?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; that is true, but the Budget usually is very liberal.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman a moment ago said that he traveled around for 30 days going over these projects in the field that were subject to the Interior Department Appropriation Subcommittee, of which the gentleman is a member.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. And the gentleman came right back and said that they are doing a grand job in the field.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not a fact, and it is a fact from my observation, that the members of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee get as much enthused over the work involved in the appropriations they are handling as those who are spending the money after you give it to them, and especially is that true of the Subcommittee on the Interior Department. Anybody who stays around here knows that. We have had more roll calls on the Interior Department appropriation bill than any other appropriation bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman know that the last appropriation bill brought in by our Subcommittee on the Interior—and I have only been a member of the Appropriations Committee during this term—there were no amendments introduced, and it went through as we recommended after we had cut it down considerably in committee. I refer to the last bill brought in by the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations. However, we cut that bill arbitrarily on most items, because we did not have the facts which my bill will give if adopted.

Mr. COCHRAN. Maybe that is the reason.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is a poor way to legislate.

Mr. JENSEN. That is what I am trying to get away from.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You cut it without any rhyme or reason.

Mr. JENSEN. That is the way it is done much of the time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not think that is quite proper.

Mr. WINTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WINTER. Is it not a fact that the very thing the gentleman is trying to bring about in his own committee has already been adopted by the Ways and Means Committee? We have seen concrete evidence of its workings through the fact that committee has cut down a recent request from \$10,500,000,000 to \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. They have a staff of experts working for their committee, that is true.

Mr. COCHRAN. They have a committee on internal-revenue taxation.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As a colleague of the gentleman from Iowa on the Appropriations Committee, I am back of him 100 percent in this effort. I think it is a wonderful proposition. He and I both know that we sit day after day as a subcommittee. We have appearing before us defense attorneys, so-called, for the appropriations requested, and you and I have to act both as a juror and as the prosecution.

Mr. JENSEN. That is exactly right.

Now, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we had better start saving some money wherever we can, or we will never be able to live up to and fulfill the promises we are making to our soldier boys and girls who return after winning this war. It is going to take a lot of money to fulfill all the promises we have made them. There is nothing too good for them, and we had better start saving some money in order to pay that bill, so we can prove to them that our word is as good as our promises.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a personality portrait of the gentleman from Michigan, Representative ENGEL, by Robert St. John of the National Broadcasting Co.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the Oil City Derrick.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

VIEWS OF CONSTITUENTS ON THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I have been wondering ever since Congress took its recess this summer whether other Members received the same reaction from their constituents that I received during that recess. The real purpose of these remarks is to perhaps arouse a little discussion, either on the floor or in the cloakrooms. I have been wanting for some time to report on the reaction of my constituents.

People quite generally seem to be more than pleased with the military developments of the present war. We have received just about every good break our Army and Navy could hope for, but, as in the case of a good football team, those breaks have usually been made. I found practically no criticism of the administration of the War and Navy Departments, but there seemed to be a great

deal of confusion and considerable dissatisfaction with the management of the war effort on the home front. The President has said there is no dividing line between the home front and the military front, but it seems to me I do discern a dividing line between our activities on the military and naval fronts and our activities on the home front.

Several times people have said to me, in substance, "Why don't you people in Congress do this or that or the other thing?" There seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding as to just how bills become law. Few realize how helpless—and I think that is the proper word—an individual Member of the House is, and certainly how helpless the minority party is, when it comes to getting legislation on the floor. They do not seem to realize that while any Member can introduce legislation it must be acted upon by a committee of the House. Quite rightfully, the committees are controlled by the majority party. If a bill introduced by the minority successfully weathers the storm of a hearing and brings about the support of a few of the majority Members and gets out of the committee with a favorable report, it then has to get by the Committee on Rules. So it is very easy to say to a Member of the House, "Why don't you do this and that?" But it is very difficult to start the action and carry it through to its completion.

However, I was more disturbed by the fact that a great many people blamed Congress for things over which Congress has no control. I think that has been built up quite extensively in the past few years by employees of the Federal Government located in our various States and districts who tell the people who inquire or complain about certain activities, "Oh, well; after all, we do not write the laws, we are only carrying out the laws written by Congress." But when you sit down with those same people and try to find out just what it is that is bothering them, my experience has been that it is not the laws to which they object but the regulations that have been issued to carry those laws into effect.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Oftentimes these persons who have been working for the Government out in the country, in the gentleman's district and in mine, are very careful to cover up that what the people are complaining about may be a bureau directive with which Congress had nothing to do.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I was just going to explain that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The question of whether or not and how any particular commodity shall be rationed is something never submitted to the Congress. Is not that so?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think definitely so.

Mr. CURTIS. The question of a price ceiling and its effect on production and distribution is never submitted to the Congress. That action is carried out by the agents of the President, in whom is vested authority to promulgate rules and regulations.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is necessarily so. I am not complaining about that. I am simply trying to place the responsibility in the minds of the people who are asking questions.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does not the gentleman believe that a lot of this dissatisfaction comes from the usurpation of power by the smaller officeholders, many times even without the approval of their master in Washington? In other words, they take it upon themselves to do certain things. They have a job in which they have to show their authority over something and they issue letters—I shall be glad to show to the gentleman some of them about matters I have tried to get ironed out—in which, contrary to any law or authority from Washington, they harass the people, when there is absolutely no reason to do so. We are appropriating money for a war-food program, and they are going out there and doing more harm than good as far as the war-food program is concerned.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That seems to be human nature.

During the recess I had anywhere from 30 to 60 and 70 people come into my office each day. Several times in a discussion of O. P. A. and its regulations and prices I would ask them this question: "Do you think Congress should repeal the Price Control Act and wipe that law off the books and let the law of supply and demand operate during the war, letting things reach their own level?" Only two people with whom I talked took that position. So I came to the conclusion that the people were not dissatisfied with the price-control law, that people generally recognize that we must have a certain amount of control, considerably more control during this time of war than we normally would have, but that they resent, and I think rightfully so, many of the regulations issued by the O. P. A.

The same thing is true of the forms prepared by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in connection with the revision of the tax laws. The bill that we passed to revise the method of collecting taxes was very simple. I had several people say to me, "I thought you were going to simplify the collection of income, but I have just been over to the Internal Revenue Department, and I cannot find anybody there who knows how properly to fill out these forms, or how much to deduct or not to deduct." There again is something that Congress is blamed for, but we cannot be expected to prepare the forms. I explained that all we had done was to change the method of the

collection of taxes, and to provide for a report to be made on September 15, and for a final deduction or correction at the end of the year, but as to the preparation of these forms, that had to be turned over to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, but I am hopeful that with the experience we have had in the past, next year that form will be very much revised.

The people generally are demanding action on some of these things, that we have talked about for the last 8 or 10 months, and if they do not get action, they are certainly going to hold this Congress responsible. I have referred to things that the people complain of, and that I contend are not the responsibility of Congress, but I would like now to point out some of the things that I believe Congress is responsible for, particularly the majority party, and with which we should deal in the near future.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. It is also true that the folks back home do not make any distinction between what goes on in Washington, and what Congress does, and what the bureaus do, what they legislate upon by bureaucratic directives, and that is something that I think Congress should be alert to, in correcting some of this bureaucratic legislation by directives.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree with that, and that is what I am trying to indicate, that people are blaming the Congress for, when I do not think the Congress is responsible at all.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very glad to hear that the people are demanding action. I am very sure that every Member on the floor here today is in favor of action, which would mean that about 80 percent of those present, being Republicans, are strong for action; but we are not getting action. All that we are getting from the majority is a long succession of apathetic alibis. How are we going to get this action? The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] today presented the means of striking at one of the greatest weaknesses in the Government, and that is the spending and the squandering of public money. He has introduced a bill, and I think the Record should show and the country should know that if that bill is not enacted, the Democratic majority has squelched it, and the majority party has defeated a matter of economy and has failed to meet its responsibility, because the Republicans are demanding action and the power of the majority keeps us from securing it. There is a system of scientific, logical, legislative approach which should be in operation, instead of the Appropriations Committee continuing to be simply a jury, looking blindly at evidence which they do not understand, and I am delighted to go along with the gentleman in his demand for action on these important points, which today are crippling the war front at home and abroad.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to inquire as to just what this scientific bill is that is going to do so much to bring about economy and help our economy.

Mr. MUNDT. Was the gentleman on the floor when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] explained his bill?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman means the bill to provide scientific experts for the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am quite sure that most of the Members on the majority side are in favor of that.

Mr. MUNDT. Then let us have action on it. Let us pass it tomorrow or Friday or next week.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman knows that I am not even on the committee that is going to consider the bill, and the gentleman ought not to charge me with responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. I am delighted to hear the gentleman is in favor of it, and if enough people on the gentleman's side will say what he has, then we will get action.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will further yield, I do think that in hiring these experts some attention should be paid to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] said, that we have to approach it rather carefully, and examine personally the number of people to be hired, because we could very easily build up a bureaucracy on the Hill and make ourselves subject to the criticism that has been made against the bureaus downtown.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree for one; and I am happy to know that the gentleman's voice makes it unanimous, as he is the only Democrat present.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think there is one problem that the Congress must deal with, and perhaps the most important problem we face. It certainly has a definite bearing on the war effort. In my humble opinion, there is not a single Member of this House but realizes right now that we are using petroleum at a faster rate than we are taking it out of the ground. There is not a Member of the House but what realizes that the demands for gasoline and lubricating oil for the war effort are becoming greater every month. It is generally understood that the railroads of Italy are practically useless for the transportation of war material that we are going to use in that country. More and more of the equipment handled by our Army will have to be handled by motortruck and other types of motor vehicles. Unless some way is found to get more crude oil out of the ground in this country it is very reasonable to assume that if this war lasts even 12 months longer, we will face a critical shortage of gasoline, not only for our civilian needs, but that it will become so scarce that we will not have enough for our military and naval needs.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Under present conditions, the crude oil we are getting out of the ground will only last from 12 to 15 years, and the administration has done nothing to increase it. Is that not correct?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is right. Not only that, but it is actually decreasing it. There are thousands of stripper wells that are going out of business every month.

Mr. LANDIS. And we have bills in Congress that will take care of the situation?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Very definitely. Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator for War, has made his recommendations. I cannot, for the life of me, see why anybody in this Government needs to fear increasing the price of crude oil 35 to 40 cents a barrel. We are told on dependable authority that that means an increase of 1 cent in the retail price of gas. We know that in normal times gasoline fluctuated at the pump anywhere from 1 to 5 or 6 cents a gallon. We paid 20 cents a gallon and we felt pretty good about it. When we had to pay 25 or 28 we crabbled a little about it. But, now it is down in twenties and we are satisfied. Still this Government has failed in the past several months to permit a slight increase in the price of crude oil, which means an increase of 1 cent in the price of gas. We are definitely jeopardizing our means of transportation, both for the Army and the Navy, and for our civilian supplies, by not taking that action.

Mr. LANDIS. One of the best ways to get action on the crude oil is to sign petition No. 14, on the Speaker's desk?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I was coming to the subject of the petition, in a second.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. It might be interesting to you to know that I just came back from my district in Pennsylvania, in the Pennsylvania grade crude area, and that our production in the last 8 months is off 1,700,000 barrels of oil. This field is right on the western edge of this eastern shortage of fuel oil and gasoline. One million seven hundred thousand barrels of oil would have produced 50,000,000 gallons of gasoline, also fuel oil that could have been supplied to the eastern seaboard, where you are short fuel oil and gasoline, not figuring the lubricating oil that could be used for the war effort, especially needed for our fighter planes. I would say that in my district approximately 7,500 to 8,000 wells are not on the pump. Leases are being abandoned. The wells are being scrapped, casings are being pulled and sold to the junkmen, and one of our basic industries, upon which my State and thousands of our people are directly and indirectly dependent, is being lost because of the short-sighted policy of the impractical visionaries in charge of establishing these prices over in the Office of Price Administration. You can readily see what great relief we could afford to you people in the New England States in the

way of fuel oil and gasoline if a price increase were granted, because deliveries could be made by tank trucks. This price increase on oil has been static since October 1941, when it was frozen at artificially low levels. Manpower has become scarcer, labor costs are up, materials costs are up, everything that enters into production of oil has greatly increased, and the price remains the same. Common sense should prevail. There is flexibility in this Price Control Act, and they could advance the price of crude and secure increased production to meet the needs of our people and the demands of the war effort, but the group over in O. P. A. insist on rationing the ever-smaller quantities available instead of increasing the price to increase production to secure fuel oil, gasoline, lubricating oil, and the byproducts necessary for civilian needs and the war effort. And there is not anything you can do about it. They are going to "hold the line." That seems to be the policy, instead of using good, sound judgment and affording relief to the gasoline-hungry people throughout the eastern area.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. We have reported a bill out of the Committee on Mines and Mining that will take oil from coal and shale. If they get oil from the shale, our crude oil will last 65 years. If we get it from coal, shale and oil wells our oil production will last 1,000 years. We have voted out of our committee a bill which will establish three temporary or starting plants to take this oil from coal and shale. We would like to get this legislation passed so that if we do not find the oil under the ground in the pools, we will be able to get it from coal and shale.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. We have got to do something and do it soon.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. It may interest the gentleman to know that in a recent dispatch our actual losses, in the dollar-value of planes, fortresses, bombers, and fighters destroyed by enemy action in the last 6 months has been approximately \$147,000,000. That has been a wartime expenditure productive of devastating results to the enemy. On the other hand, the administration approves a project up in the Canadian wilderness where we are spending \$138,000,000 to develop the oil resources of Canada at the expense of the American taxpayers and thus far according to the statement of R. W. Gallagher, of the Standard of New Jersey, they have secured about 3,000 barrels of oil a day, a negligible quantity. While we are producing in the United States 4,250,000 barrels of oil a day and we produced 1,385,000,000 last year, the administration is asking us to up that to 1,550,000,000 next year. With that \$138,000,000 expended in the proven fields of Pennsylvania it would have produced several hundred thousand barrels of oil a day. We talk about oil and getting results; there is \$138,000,000 that

could have been invested in our own back yard that would have produced oil to meet all the demands of our civilian needs and war effort.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that in New England we face freezing again as we did last winter so far as coal is concerned because the administration has bungled coal just as badly as it bungled oil last year and is still bungling it. It is a most unfortunate situation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think there has been more bungling in the case of oil and coal than any two subjects with which this Government has dealt during the war. Private people were urged, and industry was compelled to convert their oil burners to coal and now they come along and make them convert back to oil at a time when the chance of getting oil amounts to nothing. It is my contention that the oil will not be forthcoming unless we find some way to stimulate production.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is a tragedy of errors, both oil and coal.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Every agency of Government and every committee of the House and the other body that has gone into the subject at all has come to the one conclusion that there is a real shortage of oil; and nothing is being done to encourage production for fear it would establish a precedent. I am in favor in this instance of legislative action to raise the price ceiling on oil. I am willing to go along with that in the case of crude oil. I think it is so important to the war effort and to the civilian effort at this time that I would go along with legislation of that kind, dangerous as it might be.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a great study of the subject.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Certainly something should be done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on one other subject and raise one question that I hope those who favor a roll-back of prices and the payment of subsidies will attempt to answer in the not-too-distant future. I have received numerous letters in which it has been contended that if this Congress should forbid the payment of roll-back subsidies, the consumer subsidies on meat, butter, and milk, and so forth, the lid would be off and we would be faced with uncontrolled inflation. Nobody has explained to me how that is going to come about. Certainly those who so contend do not mean that if this administration is refused its desire to pay roll-back subsidies it is going to take off all control and let prices go as high as they may. I do not believe they are going to take any such dog-in-the-manger attitude as that. I cannot for the life of me see how the price can be reduced 3 or 4 cents a pound on meat and butter below the present level any more than it can be held at the present market level, and I hope somebody who contends for subsidies will answer that

question for me before the bill is brought up for consideration.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. It may be interesting to the gentleman to know that Fred M. Vinson, the Economic Stabilizer, has also offered the oil industry incentives to increase production, but the oil producer does not want any part of incentives, and I have not the slightest idea where he would get the money to pay them if they did accept, as Congress has made no such appropriation.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the energy, effort, manpower, and expenditures that are being made in connection with the war-food program prompt me at this time to call the attention of my colleagues and the people of this country to an important fact in connection with this food program. I am more convinced each day that honeyed words never fed and never will feed a people.

The fact that I wish to bring out in these few minutes is substantiated in Circular No. 670 of the United States Department of Agriculture, which discusses feed consumption by livestock. It states that—

The average person (including children) should have 2,600 calories of energy a day and should have about 67 grams or 0.15 pound of protein a day; therefore that number of feed units used by each class of livestock to produce 2,600 calories and 0.15 pound of protein was calculated.

The amount of feed used to produce the 2,600 calories of human food is as follows—page 44 of Circular 670:

Feed used to produce 2,600 calories of human food

	Hogs	Cows	Beef cattle
All feed, including pasture....	7.66	9.31	71.65
All feed except pasture.....	7.17	5.62	31.04
Grain and concentrates only...	7.17	2.26	15.16

In other words, it takes 71.6 pounds of all feed including pasture, when fed to beef cattle to produce 2,600 calories of human food. The dairy cow only requires 9.3 pounds to produce the same amount of food energy while the hog uses only 7.66 pounds. When these animals are fed grain and concentrates the dairy cow requires considerably less of this feed to produce the 2,600 calories, thus demonstrating her value as an efficient food energy producer.

The amount of feed used to produce the fifteen one-hundredths pound of protein needed is shown in the following table:

Feed used to produce 0.15 pound of protein

	Hogs	Cows	Feed cattle
All feed including pasture....	11.58	4.76	28.68
All feed except pasture.....	10.83	2.87	12.43
Grain and concentrates only...	10.83	1.1	6.07

This manifests the proficiency of the dairy cow in producing protein.

Page 44 from this same circular reveals:

Human food produced by 10 feed units of all feed, except pasture

Calories plus protein index:

Milk cows.....	2.56
Hogs.....	1.16
Turkeys.....	1.14
Laying flocks.....	.99
Chickens raised.....	.92
Beef cattle.....	.56
Sheep and lambs.....	1.04

There are practical angles to consider in the production of these livestock products, such as labor, location, and so forth. A producer might be able to produce one of the products but find no way to sell it due to distance and transportation difficulties in reaching the market.

Though the hog is a high-ranking producer of calories, the cow is the outstanding animal when it comes to converting feeds into calories and protein foods for human consumption.

What is the significance of these scientific facts. First, it is no doubt the basis for the more-milk program of the War Food Administration. The handling of the dairy program may have lacked judgment at times, but nevertheless the objective to increase the supply of milk and its products was a scientific, practical, and desirable approach. Though we had half a million more cows on January 1, 1943, than the same time in 1942, we are evidently producing some billion pounds less milk in 1943.

Second, since the W. F. A. more or less have taken over the food supplies, it is their direct responsibility to see that this feed is used for the best advantage, that of producing the most human food. I appreciate the difficulties. I realize the pressures. But the facts remain that as much as possible these protein feeds should be allocated to the animals that make the most efficient use of them. This animal is the dairy cow—"the foster mother of the human race."

Dairy cattle furnish about 40 percent of the beef and veal supply of the Nation, so be assured this is not a dairy versus beef argument.

In conclusion, let us expect the protein feeds to be allocated to the dairy sections wherever possible, where it can be done fairly to other groups. Then let us adopt a constructive program that will increase and maintain the milk production of the Nation and make the millions of additional pounds of milk fat and solids available for human consumption.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to know if the dairymen get any preference on this protein feed?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I can only answer that by saying that my contacts with the departments have indicated that they realize the importance of milk production. I hope, however, this protein feed will be distributed where it will produce the most human food. That is the only contention I am trying to make here. I may say Wisconsin is recognized as the No. 2 bad spot in this country as far as protein is concerned. Wisconsin produces from 10 to 15 percent of the milk of this Nation, and is entitled to its fair share. I certainly hope they will not funnel this feed off into places where it will not make the contribution it should make to the war food program.

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to ask the gentleman another question about the ceiling prices on hogs and cattle. Is there a ceiling price on both of them and, if not, why is there on one and not on the other?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will answer that by saying that the former Secretary of Agriculture was a great hog man and he started the increase in the pork-production program. Since that time it seems that they have agreed on a ceiling for hogs without much difficulty. There seems to be a spirit that the beef cow is a little higher class than other animals, and it is immoral and sinful to put a ceiling on beef cattle although it seems to be moral and not sinful to put it on hogs and on other farm products. I think that results from the legislative situation that has prevailed for many years by which these beef men have had a lot more to say than the importance of their business really justifies. In my opinion, it is the opposition of the beef people themselves that has prevented a ceiling being put on beef cattle, although this last O. P. A. order is practically a ceiling the way it has been manipulated.

Mr. LANDIS. Since I consider the gentleman an authority on agricultural problems, I would like for him to answer one more question. I understand that beef and hogs are coming to the market to be butchered, and have been in the last few weeks, yet in our localities back home the rationing points are still pretty high on hogs at the butcher shop. I feel at this time when meat is plentiful our people ought to get more consideration so far as eating more meat is concerned. I might also add that I feel the Government has been buying up so much food and stuff, such as potatoes, canned milk, dried milk and dried beans, and letting millions and millions of bushels spoil, that the people ought to be allowed to eat this meat while it is available, because I am afraid that next February and March beef and pork will not be so plentiful. That is when we will find our greatest shortage. I wonder if the gentleman believes that we ought to have more relaxation on this problem of getting more meat to eat while it is available and plentiful?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. When you discuss food products, you are always

in danger. There are two different problems involved here. We have produced pork, and we have considerably more than we now consume in this country, whereas with beef we have been on an importing basis for years. We have been using a very constructive attitude toward maintaining an increased production of pork. This last ceiling that has been put into operation for next year is very discouraging in one particular, and that is that although with twenty to forty billion dollars of surplus purchasing power I do not like to admit that we cannot even pay the farmer a parity price for his pork during that time. Hogs, as I said above, are efficient producers of calories and come next to dairy cows in efficient calorie and protein production.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] made a comment upon the number of Democrats present this afternoon, I think it only fair that the RECORD should show there are 9 Republicans present who will have the pleasure of listening to my speech.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman say how many Democrats are listening?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman mentioned before that I was the only one.

Mr. MUNDT. There are now two others, three of you now. You are gaining.

Mr. WRIGHT. Possibly the two heard I was going to speak and came over.

Mr. MUNDT. The election returns in Kentucky are gaining, but not fast enough.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Of course, the RECORD should also show that the gentleman has the last special order today.

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe there is one after me.

Mr. CURTIS. And also that countless numbers of Republicans were here and left.

Mr. WRIGHT. As soon as they finished their speeches. I am not going to draw any unfavorable inference and I would like to also state for the RECORD that I do not think the Republicans should be criticized any more than the Democrats for not being present this afternoon.

There are very many duties a Congressman has besides listening to special orders on the floor. We had no legislative business anticipated, although we did have the Philippine matter brought up, I believe in more or less an unexpected manner. Since we are on that subject, I am quite certain that the Members on both sides of the aisle who

are not here this afternoon are in their offices or at some of the various bureaus following out their other congressional duties.

I should like to speak for a moment on a subject which seems to exercise most of the people today, probably more than anything else, and that is the pending Commodity Credit Corporation bill. I do not think all the truth is on either side of this controversy. I do not feel that subsidies are as vicious as some of their opponents would seem to charge, nor do I think they are the one and the only answer to the prevention of inflation. I think we have to approach this subject in the spirit of reason and common sense. It is rather foolish to get exercised about it as if it were a question of morals. It is a pure question of economics. How are we best going to preserve our domestic economy during the stress and strain of a war?

A few of us, eight in number, yesterday filed a minority report in which we differed with the action of the majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency when they reported the Commodity Credit Corporation bill with section 3, which absolutely forbids the further use of subsidies.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman means it forbids the use of a subsidy in any way that would help to prevent an increase in the cost of living. It still permits numerous subsidies as long as they do not help to prevent inflation.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is correct. Subsidies are so grounded and so inherent in our economic structure that if we should attempt by legislation to abolish the use of all subsidies we should immediately cause a financial collapse. I was going to attack the problem from a slightly different angle than that.

In addition to the eight who signed the minority report, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] substantially agrees with our conclusions but arrives at them from a different point of view and uses different arguments.

So we now get to the question of whether or not section 3 of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill is going to have a good effect or a bad effect upon our economy.

I said the other day when I spoke in the House on this subject, that when any person who is opposed to subsidies gets up on the floor and says that subsidies are inflationary, and also says that subsidies are vicious because they conceal from the people the actual operation of our economy, I am inclined to agree with him. If there were not counterbalancing arguments on the other side which I consider more urgent and important, I would myself be against food subsidies.

Subsidies are not desirable, but they are a weapon against inflation. They are vastly preferable to an inflated economy. As to the argument that the abolition of subsidies would tend to reduce inflation by capturing some of the excess

purchasing power which is familiarly known as "hot money," I would say that would be true if we could be certain that wages would not rise as a result of the rise in the cost of living.

Congress directed the President to stabilize prices and wages substantially as of September 15, 1942. The date was arbitrary and the freezing order preserved whatever inequities as to income and prices were in effect at that time. Any date which Congress might have chosen would have been equally arbitrary and equally harmful to some in the less-favored groups. I may say that that is true with reference to wages as well as prices.

There was a very able address delivered on the floor today in which the fact was commented upon that a substantial portion of the nonoperating employees of the railroads get somewhere in the neighborhood of 46 cents an hour, which is, of course, completely out of line with other industrial wages.

The only protection we have against increased wages is the maintenance of the present price structure. If prices are increased demands for increased wages will follow immediately. If these demands are resisted production of essential war equipment will be impaired. The Price Control Act ties wages to prices. One cannot rise without the other. There may be Members who, without reflecting fully upon the subject, might say, "Well, the people who are working in industries have no right to demand a raise in wages. The demands should be resisted, they should be reduced."

We are operating in a tight economy at the present time. Labor is scarce and goods are scarce. It is an inevitable effect that when you do have a scarcity you always have a demand for high prices and wages. It is not a question of human weakness or frailty; it is the operation of an economic law.

Our greatest job now in winning the war is to get the war material to the battlefields. Anybody who has a realistic sense of present-day events must agree that if prices go up to the consumer and if the consumer, who also happens to be a worker, demands as a result thereof that his wages be increased, and if that demand is refused it is going to impair the production of essential war material.

The Little Steel formula that is very often spoken about and that was assailed on the floor this afternoon from the standpoint of being inequitable to labor, attempts to give workmen a raise in wages which is the equivalent of the 15-percent increase in the cost of living which existed as of September 15, 1942. Since that time the cost of living has gone up some 7 percent. At the present time under this very Little Steel formula these wages, which the Government is trying to keep down—trying to resist demands for increases in wages which are being made by practically every group of workmen—are out of line 7 percent now with the Little Steel formula. It is entirely possible that we may be able to resist the demands for increases in wages at

the present time, but the other 3-percent increase in the cost of living which will immediately result by passing the Commodity Credit Corporation bill with section 3 in it prohibiting subsidies, will certainly be the straw that breaks the camel's back and will cause a demand for an increase in wages not corresponding to the 3 percent but to the 3 percent plus the 7 percent, which is the extent to which wages now are out of line with the Little Steel formula, or 10 percent.

Our country's wage bill is the approximate sum of \$100,000,000,000 at the present time. If you increase that wage bill 10 percent you increase it \$10,000,000,000. Our Government is the purchaser of the products of over 50 percent of that wage bill, so you will immediately cause the Government to pay \$5,000,000,000 more for the articles which it needs for war, or 50 percent of the sum I have indicated.

I also spoke the other day concerning a very substantial number of our citizens whose purchasing power has not been increased since the outbreak of the war. When we consider the fact that there has been a 22-percent increase in the cost of living at the present time, their real wage, or their purchasing power, is actually less than it was 4 years ago. Various figures have been given as to the number of these people. I have attempted to accumulate the statistics from various Government departments, and although I did not personally collect them, I think I have the right to take them as accurate. Approximately 25,000,000 nonfarm workers have less purchasing power, less real wages, than they had 4 years ago. These are composed of nonmanufacturing workers such as service employees, transportation employees, Government employees, public-utility employees, and various other classes. I want it to be understood also that the wages that I am considering when I say they have less purchasing power than 4 years ago include whatever extra amount they may obtain for overtime, whether it be straight time or time and a half.

We also have another class in a worse condition and these are the so-called people of fixed income. They include those receiving public assistance, allotments, various sorts of pensions, railroad retirement, civil-service pensions, and so forth. They total over 8,000,000 people. In other words, there are over 33,000,000 people who are less able to meet their living expenses than they were in August 1939, and an increase in the living costs of this group would be unfair and in many cases unbearable. The recent increase of allotments to soldiers' dependents and widows would be of little use if the living costs of those dependents are increased.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman not think that this problem could be approached by passing the Herter plan, for example, and provide cheaper food for lower income groups,

those that have not received any increase?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that is the wrong approach, although I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Wisconsin who asks the question and also for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] who introduced the bill. I think the right thing to do is to keep the cost of living down, and if we want to reach the excess purchasing power of the country, that is bearing so hard on the stabilization line at this time, I believe that we ought to increase taxes. I believe that increased taxation is the only possible way that you can destroy the pressure of this so-called excess money on the stabilization line.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I was interested in the gentleman's statement about 33,000,000 people who have smaller take-home wages than they had 4 years ago. In arriving at those figures does the compiler of the figures deduct taxes before the take-home money is evaluated?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think not. I do not think taxes are deducted, but these figures do not take into consideration the family income, where there are more than one person who work in a family. I got those figures from the Department of Labor.

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman has the date on them, that might indicate whether the pay-roll tax was in effect at that time.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have so many statistics here which I have attempted to learn and study and compare, that I am afraid I might get a little mental indigestion if I attempted to do so now, but I would be glad to show the gentleman the figures and source from which I obtained them after I have finished.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the gentleman has the same difficulty that all of us have in arriving at statistics from various departments, which do not seem to jibe with one another. One set of figures will apparently say that the wage earner has received a greater proportion of increase than the farmer, and another set of figures from an equally reputable Government source indicates that the farmer has received more than the wage earner, and it is very hard for the layman confronted with a tableful of statistics, to know which to believe.

Mr. WRIGHT. I may say to the gentleman in response, the percentage of increase in the 1935-39 level—and I think I have the figures that will bear this out—the farmer has a greater percentage of increase, if you compare him with all nonagricultural workers; but on the other hand, his income in that 1935-39 period was probably disproportionately low. So that is not a fair comparison. Also, there is one group of non-agricultural workers which has had an extremely high percentage of increase, which includes manufacturing employees, also mining employees and construction employees. Outside of that,

income has not increased to the worker. These few absorb these fabulous figures as to workers' incomes with which we are constantly confronted by exponents of that economic theory, which would increase the cost of living to the non-farmer workers, at the present time.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Does the gentleman have the figure for the workers in industry who are receiving around \$1.25, \$1.50, and \$1.75 an hour? The last figure I had was around 7,000,000.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have the figures here, and I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANDIS. I just want to finish, if you will permit. A wrong impression has been given out through the country that most all of these defense workers and other workers have received these big wages. In my own district I have parachute workers, working for less than 40 cents an hour, doing war work. The Little Steel formula, adding 15 percent, does not mean much to those people, because it is only a very few cents per hour. The big bulk of the labor is having a tough time meeting the situation.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad the gentleman said that, because I do think that, although our national income is at an all-time high, it is not spread equally, and what might be a very fair thing to do to the highly paid employee, who is getting more money than he ever did, is not at all fair to the person who receives barely a living income at the present time, and is at the present time confronted with an increase in the cost of living.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. I want to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is making an enlightening address. He is zealously representing his people and I have a high regard for the gentleman. I want to ask him this question: It is estimated that in 1943, the income will be some \$140,000,000,000. Of that \$140,000,000,000 some \$16,000,000,000 will be spent for taxes, leaving \$124,000,000,000, of that \$124,000,000,000 some \$82,000,000,000 will be spent over the counter for consumer goods. That leaves \$42,000,000,000 and out of the \$42,000,000,000, say, \$25,000,000,000 goes into insurance premiums, the purchase of bonds, and savings accounts of all kinds. That leaves \$17,000,000,000 now running loose in the economy. Do you not think at this time, during wartime, we are better able to pay our food bills now, rather than borrow this billion or five billion and issue bonds and notes against it, which is highly inflationary? Do you not think we should pay our own grocery bills now, rather than to have these soldier boys come back and be faced with this enormous debt—absolutely needless?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma to answer that.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the gentleman's question is a very important one. It has been mentioned on the floor a number of times, whether we should pass on to the soldier boys when they come back today's grocery bills. I would say to the gentleman I think it is much more important that we pass on to those soldier boys when they come back a dollar that is worth a dollar rather than a dollar that is worth a dime.

Mr. GATHINGS. May I ask the gentleman to yield again at that point?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. The second bond drive netted \$18,000,000,000. Out of that \$18,000,000,000 only \$3,000,000,000 or \$4,000,000,000 were subscribed by the individual citizen. The other \$14,000,000,000 or \$15,000,000,000 went to the investment bankers. What do they do in turn? They issue currency against it. That is what you want to do here. You want to borrow some more money and then let another bond drive come along and the investment bankers subscribe to it and issue currency. Where are we?

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. First, I want to correct the gentleman about the last bond drive. It was not \$18,000,000,000 that the investment bankers got above the \$3,000,000,000 individual subscriptions. Fifteen billion dollars of that went to noninflationary sources on which these bonds could not serve as a basis of currency to be issued. They were noninflationary purchases.

Mr. WRIGHT. Corporations and such?

Mr. MONRONEY. Corporations; yes. Money like that is not reissued. In further reference to the gentleman's point that we are adding to the fires of inflation, I would like to say that the subsidy program, if it is applied, will cost us in the neighborhood of \$800,000,000. If investing \$800,000,000 rather than breaking the Little Steel formula by 10 percent, which you will do if you increase the cost of living this additional 3 percent, you will have to issue \$10,000,000,000 worth of bonds to pay for these purchases that the increased wage costs will bring about.

Mr. GATHINGS. Oh, that \$800,000,000 is just a start.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not the duty of Congress, then, to have the courage to say how far you can go, and not to take a simplified line of thinking by saying, "All subsidies must be out"?

Is it not our duty to say: "We think you can use subsidies thus far and no further. Come back here in a few months and get permission for further use." I do not believe we can simplify our thinking to say simply that because we want to hold down the price of sugar by providing subsidies that we should take off a subsidy that is working on 20 percent of the sugar but holding the price of all sugar down by a penny a pound but because of its being necessary to subsidize this 20 percent 1 cent a pounds we should let the other 80 percent go up. I think we have got to say

which one is the cheaper and it is the duty of Congress to go into this and study it.

Mr. GATHINGS. I think it is the duty of Congress, yes, to act at this time. Now, section 3 of this bill—

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt this very interesting colloquy. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma is doing my job probably better than I could do it myself, but there are several other features in this bill which I think should be pointed out, some features you probably may not have recognized.

Section 3 would increase the cost to the Government of the food which it purchases for the war. In the minority report we stated that this amounts to 30 percent of the food production. Those figures we felt were correct at the time, but the President in his message stated that it was 25 percent that went to the Government; so, if we increase the cost to the Government on 25 percent of the food products, obviously any fair basis of estimate as to what subsidies are going to cost must be adjusted by that figure because in the subsidy program you pay the money but when the Government buys food it saves the amount of the subsidy. Also, the increase of cost to the consumer would be greater than the amount of the subsidy which would be saved by reason of section 3. The increased price to the producer would be magnified by added margins and mark-ups which are generally added to an article, as I understand, on a percentage basis. By the time the product reaches the consumer it would cost more than the amount of the subsidy.

Section 3 does not forbid all food subsidies. It specifically exempts vegetable fats, oils, and oilseed; and this is rather interesting, I believe, to people who come from the dairy States. Vegetable fats, oils, and oilseeds include margarine and vegetable shortening oils on which subsidies may be allowed, but no subsidy can be paid on butter.

It also means that 20 percent of our sugar consumption would be increased in price by 1 cent a pound if subsidies were removed. In a matching of this price the sugar we import, which is 80 percent of our consumption, must consequently be raised in price an equal amount.

Here, to my mind, is a feature of this bill which should be of interest to you gentlemen who are from agricultural regions: Support prices under existing law are fixed for the sole purpose of bringing out the maximum production of needed food items under section 3. In the future the War Food Administrator would also have to take into consideration the impact upon the cost-of-living index in fixing support prices, since the language specifically declares that ceiling prices must be as high as support prices. This unquestionably would lead to the lowering of some support prices now paid to farmers. In other words, section 3 states that the ceiling prices to consumers must be as high as support prices to the producers. This result can be reached in one of two ways, and in the

case of some products I suppose it would be reached in one way and in the case of other products it would be reached in another way: Either by raising the price to the consumer or cutting the support price to the producer. In other words, you can hike the ceiling price to the consumer or lower the support price to the producer. The latter course may, in many cases, interfere with production. But, on the other hand, in the exercise of their judgment, the War Food Administrator and the O. P. A. Administrator, acting together, might think that result would be less harmful than an increase in the cost of living, which would immediately cause demands for higher wages, which, if granted, might start inflation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. One more thought and then I shall be happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning of my talk, I do not believe any of us who signed this minority report are disposed to be unreasonable; none of us think that subsidies are the heaven-sent answer to all our ills. We do not want to use any more of them than we have to; we feel that we should retain the right to use subsidies; but we should put a specific dollars and cents limitation upon them; we should put a specific time limitation on them. It is not necessary to extend the use of subsidies for a period of 2 years after the war to which limit the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be extended. Let us try them for a while and see how they work; let us get them under our control. In addition I believe that all the Members of the House know that the roll-back program on butter and meat and vegetables is being administered with funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and that the Commodity Credit Corporation has nothing to do with it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for 10 additional minutes to answer questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. The officials of the War Food Administration, when they testified before our committee, assured us that no new roll-back programs are contemplated. I believe we should put in the bill language which states that there shall be no further roll-back programs; that the programs should be to maintain present prices rather than trying to reduce them unless they can be reduced by squeezing the water out of them. Informed people have told me that certain prices are too high because of the too great margin which is obtained by the middleman and that some squeezing can be done along that line.

If you can reduce the price by cutting down the middleman's margin in some cases where it is too high, I say do it,

but not by the payment of subsidies. I do not believe we should initiate any new roll-back programs.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I was very much interested in the gentleman's discussion. He manifested a very fair-minded attitude, but I am sorry I cannot agree with his conclusions.

Mr. WRIGHT. I was hoping that the gentleman would agree with me, but I feared that perhaps he might not.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that one weakness in the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Oklahoma who so ably seconds him from the standpoint of arguing always that failure to pay subsidies is going to result in inflation is a sort of a naive conclusion on your part that a demand for a wage increase is ipso facto a wage increase. You have argued repeatedly that if we have no subsidies and if there is a slight increase in the cost of living immediately there will be demands for wage increases.

Mr. WRIGHT. The demands are present now, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. MUNDT. I was about to emphasize that they are present now. I do not see how we can alter that situation. Does the gentleman believe those demands for wage increases would be automatically dissipated if we have food subsidies?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think they would exert far less pressure if we did have them. Once this 3 percent is passed on I do not think we will be able to stop there. After we leave this Maginot line or Dneiper line we are not going to be able to find another line on which we can stand and, in my opinion, it is very important that we hold this precarious line at the present time, hoping that the war soon will be over before our economy is wrecked.

Mr. MUNDT. We are pretty well beyond the line already from the standpoint of Mr. Lewis.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to discuss that, too.

Mr. MUNDT. May I ask this further question. I agree with the gentleman there are certain large groups of people in this country who have not had much, if any, of a wage increase net to them during the last few years, but is it not true that strangely enough the demand for food subsidies and the demand for high wages is coming from groups that have had these wage increases rather than from those who have not?

Mr. WRIGHT. Certainly that is true. I may say that the farm demands are coming from leaders of organized farmers, probably not from individual farmers except insofar as they have been indoctrinated with this idea. It makes not a bit of difference to a cow whether the Government pays a portion of the cost of the milk or the consumer pays it all. There are organized pressure groups in this country. One is the farm group, another is the labor group, and there is also

the industrial group, which constantly exercise pressure against officials of the Government and always will perhaps, but it is our job to resist them and try to decide fairly among the contending forces.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that all of the pressure that is coming on Congress has been from those seeking to improve their relative economic situation rather than from the millions who are being hard-damaged and crushed by this continual increase in the cost of living? We hear very little from these poor individuals whose living standards have been reduced by as much as 22 percent on account of this increase in the cost of living. I think the ear of Congress should seek out these plaintive cries and listen to those people rather than listen to the all-powerful blocs of labor, farmers, manufacturers, and businessmen whose voices ring loud throughout the land in their demands for greater profit in time of war.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman because he is the first gentleman on his side, and I include in "on his side" even Mr. Byrnes, and former O. P. A. Administrator Mr. Brown, who has brought out what he so clearly brought out this afternoon, that is that the August 1939 prices must be viewed in the light of the fact that farm commodities at that time were only bringing 50 to 75 percent of parity.

I think what the gentleman has said is going to do considerable toward getting this thing focused in the right way. I may say that I have read articles which Mr. Brown and Mr. Byrnes and all of these men have written, and what they say always irritates me greatly, because it does not seem they want to give a fair picture, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he has not made any other contribution today than that one thing has gone a long way toward getting a real, honest approach to this very ticklish problem. As a member of the gentleman's committee, I would like to ask if he can tell me one member of his committee who can inform me of the list of all the activities—I was going to say antics but I am in a good frame of mind this afternoon—that are being indulged in by this child known as the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does the gentleman mean the foods that are being subsidized?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman know of any member of his committee who can give me a list of the activities that are being funneled through Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WRIGHT. What does the gentleman mean by "activities"? I know the law provides what they shall be.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Here is an embarrassing situation: The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] for several years have had a bill pending to cancel out the old drought loans. They have collected around \$5,000,000 the last 2 years under those old drought laws.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is not that an Agricultural Adjustment Administration activity?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No. All at once under this Committee on Banking and Currency we have an agency that is coming out—I do not know how they do it without coming under the Disaster Loan Corporation, but we have the Commodity Credit Corporation in the relief business distributing hay, for example, which they are subsidizing \$14.50 a ton. I am not opposed to relief in the drought area or anything like that, but the point I want to make is that this child has grown up awfully fast, she has had lots of vitamins or something, because she is getting all inflated until she is taking over all the activities that take place in relation to agriculture, as well as taking over things that have direct control over what is on the tables of the consumers of this country.

I do not approach this from any angle against subsidies. I am willing to let that stand by itself. If I thought that this was a constructive approach, it surely would not embarrass me to vote for it.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am quite sure about that.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What puzzles me is if there is any evidence to present that the way they have been handled is going to be any approach to the problem whatever, and the same thing on this amount of money. If we would subsidize fairly and equally across the board, it would take \$500,000,000 or \$600,000,000 even to subsidize the present program, if they gave every dairy farmer the same price.

Mr. WRIGHT. Here is another idea I had. I do not have it particularly well developed yet, and there may be loopholes in it, but I think that another way to keep the control of Congress over the food situation is to have a monthly meeting, possibly of a subcommittee of our committee, with the administrative heads. I think it would be a very helpful thing, because obviously we cannot pass a law putting ceiling prices and support prices on every commodity. It is an administrative matter rather than a legislative matter. One of the greatest functions of Congress is that of criticism of the executive departments. It has always had that historic function. We could review complaints about various programs if there were this meeting at stated times. I notice several members of the committee here, and I would really be happy to find out what they think about it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has called attention to a suggestion whereby the committee would meet at certain intervals to review the situation and determine whether or not certain changes should be made.

Mr. WRIGHT. Or a subcommittee; it would not be necessary to have the full committee attend.

Mr. REES of Kansas. May I call the attention of the gentleman to a matter that I think is of some importance. When the O. P. A. advisers determined about 2 weeks ago to change the plan of subsidy on beef by providing for a subsidy on live cattle indirectly, that group was asked whether or not the livestock group, for example, the farmers and livestock men, were consulted when they gave consideration to this change. As I understand, the reply was "no," they had not consulted the livestock group or livestock organizations or farmers. Does not the gentleman believe that instead of using the term "pressure groups" as far as farmers are concerned and to feel that way toward that particular group—

Mr. WRIGHT. Let me interrupt the gentleman. I do not refer to the farmers themselves as a pressure group, I refer to the organizations which represent the farmers and which send representatives to our committees as just as much pressure groups as the labor organizations or the railroads or the manufacturers or the canal interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 736, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a hearing of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, on H. R. 2201 to provide for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce on small business.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 349. Resolution providing for expenses of members of Foreign Affairs Committee to attend meeting of United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration at Atlantic City, N. J.; without amendment (Rept. No. 847). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 3429. A bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to employ engineers and economists for consultation purposes on important reclamation work," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1406), as amended by the act of April 22, 1940 (54 Stat. 148); without amendment (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 3476. A bill to approve a contract negotiated with the Klamath Drainage District and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 3640. A bill to provide for the return of unabsorbed premiums for war-damage insurance, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3641. A bill to provide for the issuing of headstones to the next of kin of persons in the armed services who may be killed or lost in action or otherwise unaccounted for; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3642. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the deferment from service of men who are over 38 years of age and to release enlisted men from active service in the land or naval forces who have attained the thirty-eighth anniversary of their birth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to create a joint committee for the purpose of studying means for improving the organization and effectiveness of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. Res. 350. Resolution providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 351. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 784, current session) of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, on the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. Res. 352. Resolution providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people

of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 3643. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 3644. A bill for the relief of Louis T. Klauder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 3645. A bill for the relief of Mary Agnes Lichtefeld Drollman; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3488. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Rosso Fisher and other citizens of Follansbee, W. Va., opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3489. By Mr. HAGEN: Petition of Mrs. A. M. Nilsestuen, secretary of the Zion Lutheran Ladies Aid, and Mrs. H. O. Moen, both of Blackduck, Minn., and other members of the society and residents of Blackduck and community, advocating passage of House bill 2082, a bill prohibiting manufacture, sale, and/or transportation of alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3490. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, protesting against the passage of House bill 3477 which seeks to stop food subsidies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3491. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition submitted by Harry F. Pallmeier, secretary-treasurer of Joint Council No. 4, United Shoe Workers of America, and 335 other citizens, urging the Congress to provide money for subsidies which they feel will assure the roll-back of prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3492. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition signed by 5,500 war workers of northern New Jersey, supporting the President's program of price control, including the use of limited subsidies, and calling for a progressive war-tax program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3493. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition submitted by Mrs. H. G. Pearce, of Gregory, Mich., and signed by 40 other residents of the community, urging enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3494. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition signed by sundry women of Mason City, Iowa, favoring House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3495. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mrs. William B. Coling and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3496. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of sundry members of the Christiar Churches of Newark, Ohio, placing themselves on record as favoring the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), which bill would prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until demobilization is completed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3497. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of Alta McCollister and 20 other residents of Central

City, Nebr., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3498. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Robert Morris, of Batavia, Ill., and 24 citizens, urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Michael S. Wasniewski, pastor, Holy Trinity Church, Pine Grove, Denmark, Wis., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, Supreme Ruler of heaven and earth, Father of all mankind, look down from Thy heavenly throne upon us today here assembled in Thy presence. With a humble heart we acknowledge Thy supreme wisdom by which are guided the destinies of men individually and nations at large. We profess our weakness in comprehending things in the right sense and true light, unless we are enlightened by the Holy Spirit, who dispels all the darkness of our minds whenever there is a choice between right and wrong, as long as we are willing to adhere to the eternal and unchangeable laws of justice, fairness, mutual love, and universal brotherhood of all men and nations. We know we can accomplish these things if we follow the teaching of our Divine Master, Christ Jesus, who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life. * * * If you abide in Me, and My words abide in you, you shall ask whatsoever you will, and it shall be done unto you." (John xv: 7.)

Inspired with this assurance of Thy Divine Son, we implore Thee, our Heavenly Father, to shower upon the representatives of our Nation the seven gifts of Thy Holy Spirit, that is, the gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and fortitude, of knowledge and godliness and fear of the Lord, in order that all their deliberations and epoch-making decisions just now so important to the American Nation and to all liberty- and peace-loving people in all the world; that these men chosen by our American people, for the people, from among our people, may be courageously guided by that Divine Light and secure for all nations a speedy victory and a lasting peace.

I see in spirit this very moment oppressed nations, poor widows, starving orphans, looking forward and praying amid abundant tears to this very place where we are just now assembled—the Capitol of our American Government—a standing symbol of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

We, therefore, beseech Thee, our Creator and Conservator of the universe, who, in Thy divine wisdom, has allowed this terrible scourge of war to touch us, that Thou be unmindful of our past omissions, of our past indifference, of our past ingratitude; but that through the merits of the passion, death, and glorious resurrection of Thy Divine Son, and

through the graces that Thou hast showered down upon us, we may again be found worthy in Thy sight of the heritage of our fathers.

We beseech Thee, after this chastisement by which we may be cleansed from the past dross of indifference, the guile of pettiness, and the pride of personal ambitions, we may, through the mutual cooperation with Thy divine grace, be firmly grounded in the principles of love of God and man, seeking first Thy kingdom—with that guarantee—that all other things shall be added unto us.

We ask this in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 244. An act for the relief of Morris Left;

H. R. 273. An act to authorize settlement of individual claims of naval personnel for damage to private property shipped from Pearl Harbor, T. H., to San Francisco, Calif.;

H. R. 400. An act for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt;

H. R. 560. An act for the relief of the Farrell-Argast Electric Co.;

H. R. 800. An act to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States;

H. R. 1049. An act for the relief of the estate of Hyman Wiener;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Fred A. Flanders;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of Capt. Leland M. Mower and Lt. Percy K. Morrison;

H. R. 1202. An act to amend section 36 of the Criminal Code;

H. R. 1206. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to dispense with unnecessary renewals of oaths of office by civilian employees of the executive departments and independent establishments," approved August 14, 1937;

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Charles W. Ruckman;

H. R. 1555. An act for the relief of Arkansas Power & Light Co.;

H. R. 1622. An act to provide for a general term of the District Court for the District of Alaska at Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1666. An act for the relief of Helen Engell Thompson;

H. R. 1769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman;

H. R. 1887. An act for the relief of Harold E. Dalton;

H. R. 1889. An act for the relief of Andrew Williams;

H. R. 1918. An act for the relief of Edward A. Silvia;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John E. Haas;

H. R. 2244. An act for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2600. An act for the relief of M. C. Roberts;

H. R. 2675. An act providing for payment to Nellie Starr McCorkle of accumulated leave accrued and payable to her deceased